Samuel Sharpe.
Highbury. 1848.


Ex-
Libris
Biblioteca
Central
de la
Diputación
Provincial
de
Barcelona


EX LIBRIS
ESCORNALBOU

THE

PARIAN CHRONICLE,

OR

THE CHRONICLE

OF THE

ARUNDELIAN MARBLES;

WITH

A DISSERTATION

CONCERNING ITS AUTHENTICITY.

EA, QUÆ DISPUTAVI, DISSERERE MALUI, QUAM JUDICARE.
CIC.

LONDON,

PRINTED FOR J. WALTER, CHARING-CROSS.

MDCCLXXXVIII.

THE

PREFACE.

IN a late publication, entitled, An Eſſay on Punctuation, the Author, having occaſion to mention the celebrated Chronicle of the Arundelian Marbles, ſubjoins this note:

" The Parian Chronicle is ſaid to have been engraved 264 years before the Chriſtian æra; but is there no room to queſtion its authenticity?"

This note occaſioned the following letter in the Gentleman's Magazine.

" The author of an Eſſay on Punctuation has thrown out a hint, which has ſurpriſed me not a little, as it will certainly do many others, viz. that there is ſome reaſon to queſtion the authenticity of the Arundel Marbles.

The words and letters, which are added by the commentators, in order to supply the deficiencies in the Greek inscription, are placed between two brackets; and, in the English translation, the corresponding words and letters are printed in Italics.

CHRO-

CHRONICON PARIUM,

EX

MARMORIBUS ARUNDELIANIS.

Lin. 1. . . . . . ου . . . . υπαν . . . ων . . . . νων ανεγραψα τους αν[ωθεν

2. χρονους] αρξαμ[εν]ος απο Κεκροπος του πρωτου βασιλευσαντος Αθηνων, εως αρχοντος εμ Παρῳ [μεν

3. Ας]υανακτος, Αθηνησιν δε Διογνητου. Αφ ου Κεκροψ Αθηνων εβασιλευσε, και η χωρα Κεκροπια εκληθη, το προτερον καλου-

4. μενη Ακτικη απο Ακταιου του αυτοχθονος, ετη ΧΗΗΗΔΠΙΙΙ. Αφ ου Δευκαλιων παρα τον Παρνασσον εν Λυκωρεια εβασιλευσε, [βα]σιλε[υ

. . . . de-fcripfi fuperiora *tempora* orfus à Cecrope, qui primus regnavit Athenis, ufque ad Archontem in Paro *quidem* Aftyanactem, Athenis verò Diognetum.

Epoch. 1. A quo Cecrops Athenis regnavit, & regio Cecropia dicta eft, quæ priùs dicebatur Actica ab Actæo indigenâ, anni MCCCXVIII.

Ep. 2. A quo Deucalion apud Parnaffum in Lycoriâ regnavit, reg-

5. ο]ντος Αθηνων Κεκροπος, ετη ΧΗΗΗΔ. Αφ ου δικη Αθηνησι[ν εγε]νετο Αρει και Ποσειδωνι υπερ Αλιρροθιου του Ποσειδωνος, και ο τοπος εκληθη

6. Αρειος Παγος, ετη ΧΗΗ𐅄ΔΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Κρ[ανα]ου. Αφ ου κατακλυσμος επι Δευκαλιωνος εγενετο, και Δευκαλιων τους

7. ομβρους εφυγεν εγ Λυκωρειας εις Αθηνας προ[ς Κρανα]ον, και του Διο[ς του Ολυμπιου το ιερ]ον ιδ[ρυσατ]ο, [και] τα σωτηρια εθυσεν,

8. [ε]τη ΧΗΗ𐅄ΔΠ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Κρ[α]ν[α]ου. Α[φ ου Αμφι]κτυων Δευκαλιωνος εβασιλευσεν εν Θερμοπυλαις, και συνηγε

9. [τ]ους περι τον ορον οικουντας, και ω[νο]μασεν Αμφικτυονας, και Π[υλαια]ν, ου[περ] και νυν ετι θυουσιν Αμφικτυονες,

10. [ε]τη ΧΗΗ𐅄ΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμ-

nante Athenis Cecrope, anni MCCCX.

Ep. 3. A quo lis Athenis interceſſit Marti & Neptuno ſuper Halirrothio Neptuni *filio*, & locus dictus eſt Arius Pagus, anni MCCLXVIII, regnante Athenis Cranao.

Ep. 4. A quo diluvium tempore Deucalionis evenit, & Deucalion imbres fugit è Lycoriâ Athenas ad Cranaum, & Jovis *Olympii* templum extruxit, & ſacra pro ſalute fecit, anni MCCLXV, regnante Athenis Cranao.

Ep. 5. A quo Amphictyon Deucalionis *filius* regnavit in Thermopylis, & congregavit populos in viciniâ habitantes, & appellavit Amphictyonas, & *Pylæam*, ubi & nunc etiam ſacrificant Amphictyones, anni MCCLVIII, regnante Athenis Am-

φικτυονος. Αφ ου Ελλην ο Δευκ[αλιωνος Φθι]ωτιδος ε-βασιλευσε, και Ελληνες

11. [ων]ομασθησαν το προτερον Γραικοι καλουμενοι, και τον αγωνα Παναθ[η]ναι[κον συνεςησαντο, ετη] ΧΗΗ𐅄ΠΙΙ, βασιλευοντος

12. Αθηνων Αμφικτυονος. Αφ ου Καδμος ο Αγηνορος εις Θηβας αφικετο [κατα χρησμον, και] εκτισεν την Καδμει-

13. αν, ετη ΧΗΗ𐅄Π, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμφικτυονος. Αφ ου [Ευρωτας και Λακεδαιμων Λακω]-νικης εβασιλευσαν,

14. ετη ΧΗΗ𐅄ΙΙ βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμφικτυονος. Αφ ου ναυ[ς πεντ]η[κοντα κωπ]ων εξ Αιγυπτου

15. [ε]ις την Ελλαδα επλευσε, και ωνομασθη Πεντηκοντορος, και αι Δαναου θυγατερες . . . . [Αμυμ]-ωνη, και Βα . .

phictyone.

Ep. 6. A quo Hellen Deucalionis *filius* in Phthiotide regnavit, & Hellenes appellati ſunt, qui priùs Græci dicebantur, & certamen Panathenaicum inſtituerunt, anni MCCLVII, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

Ep. 7. A quo Cadmus Agenoris *filius* Thebas advenit *ſecundùm oraculum, &* condidit Cadmeam, anni MCCLV, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

Ep. 8. A quo *Eurotas & Lacedæmon in* Laconiâ regnârunt, anni MCCLII, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

Ep. 9. A quo navis *cum quinquaginta remis* ab Ægypto in Græciam appulſa eſt, & vocata eſt Pentecontorus, & Danai filiæ . . . . Amymone, & B . . . .

16. . . λαρευω, και Ελικη και Αρχεδικη αποκληρωθεισαι υπο των λοιπων [ιερον ιδρυσ]αντ[ο,]

17. και εθυσαν επι της ακτης εμ παρα[λι]αδι εν Λινδῳ της Ροδιας, ετη ΧΗΗΔΔΔΔΠΙΙ, βασιλευο[ντος Αθηνων Εριχθονιου. Αφ ου Εριχ]-

18. θονιος Παναθηναιοις τοις πρωτοις γενομενοις αρμα εζευξε, και τον αγωνα εδειχνυε, και Αθηναι[α μετω]ν[ομασε, κ]αι [αγαλμα της

19. Θ]εων μητρος εφανη εγ Κυβελοις, και Υαγνις ο Φρυξ αυλους πρωτος ηυρεν εγ Κ[ελαι]ναι[ς τη]ς Φρυγ[ι]ας, [και την Αρμονιαν την κ[α-

20. λουμενην Φρυγισι πρωτος ηυλησε, και αλλους νομους Μητρος, Διονυσου, Πανος, και τον επ[ιχωριων Θεων, και

21. Ηρωων,] ετη ΧΗΗΔΔΔΔΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Εριχθονιου του το αρμα ζευξαντος. Αφ οὑ Μινως

. . . . & Helice, & Archedice ſorte lectæ à cæteris *templum condidere*, & ſacrificarunt ſuper littus in maritimâ regione in Lindo, quæ Rhodi urbs eſt, anni MCCXLVII, regnante *Athenis Erichthonio*.

Ep. 10. *A quo* Erichthonius Panathenæis primis celebratis currum junxit, & id certamen monſtravit, & Athenæũn *nomen mutavit*, & *ſimulachrum* matris Deorum apparuit in Cybelis *montibus*, & Hyagnis Phryx tibias primus invenit in Celænis urbe Phrygiæ, & *harmoniam* quæ vocatur Phrygia primus tibiis cecinit, & alios nomos magnæ Matris, Dionyſi, Panis, & illum *patriorum Deorum & Heroum*, anni MCCXLII, regnante Athenis Erichthonio, qui currum junxit.

Ep. 11. A quo Minos *ejus nominis*

[ο] πρ[ωτος ε]βα[σιλευσε,

22. και Κυ]δωνιαν ῳκισε, και σιδηρος ηυρεθη εν τη Ιδη, ευροντων των Ιδαιων Δακτυλων Κελμιος κ[αι Δαμνανεως, ετη ΧΗ𐅄ΔΠΙΙΙ,

23. βασι]λευοντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος. Αφ ου Δημητηρ αφικομενη εις Αθηνας καρπον εφυ[τε]υεν, και πρ[ος αλλους επεμψε πρ]ωτη δ[ια

24. Τ]ριπτολεμου του Κελεου και Νεαιρας, ετη ΧΗΔΔΔΔΠ βασιλευοντος Αθηνησιν Εριχθεως. Αφ ου Τριπτο[λεμος

25. καρπον] εσπειρεν εν τη Ραρια καλουμενη Ελευσινι, ετη Χ[Η]ΔΔΔΔ[ΙΙ], βασιλευοντος Αθηνων [Εριχθεως. Αφ ο-]

26. υ [Ορφευς την] αυτου ποιησιν εξ[ε]θηκε, Κορης τε αρπαγην, και Δημητρος ζητησιν, και τ[η]ν αυτου [καταβα-

primus regnavit, & Cydoniam condidit; & ferrum inventum eſt in Idâ, inventoribus Idæis Dactylis Celmi & *Damnaneo, anni MCLXVIII*, regnante Athenis Pandione.

Ep. 12. A quo Ceres adveniens Athenas fruges ſeminavit, & ad *alias gentes miſit* prima per Triptolemum *filium* Celei & Neæræ, anni MCXLV, regnante Athenis Erichtheo.

Ep. 13. A quo Triptolemus *fruges* ſevit in Rhariâ dictâ Eleuſine, anni MCXLII, regnante Athenis *Erichtheo.*

Ep. 14. *A quo Orpheus* ejus Poeſin edidit, & Proſerpinæ raptum, & Cereris inveſtigationem, & ipſius *ad Inferos deſcen-*

27. σιν, και μυ]θο[υ]ς των υποδεξαμενων τον καρπον, ετη ΧΗΔΔΔΠ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Εριχθεως. [Αφ ου

28. Ευμολπος ο Μουσαι]ου τα μυςηρια ανεφηνεν εν Ελευσινι, και τας του [πατρος Μ]ουσαιου ποιησ[ει]ς εξεθηκ[εν, ετη ΧΗ . . . βασιλευοντος Αθηνων

29. Εριχθε]ως του Πανδιονος. Αφ ου καθαρμος πρωτον εγενετο [δια φον]ου πρωτῳ αον . . . εαντ . . . . . .

30. [ετη Χ[Δ]]ΔΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος του Κεκροπος. Αφ ου [ε]ν Ελευσινι ο γυμνικος [αγων ετεθη, ετη Χ. . . . , βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος του Κεκροπος.] Αφ ου [αι ανθρωπο-

31. θυσι]αι, [και] τα Λυκαια εν Αρκαδιᾳ εγενετο, και λ . . κκε . . . . . Λυκαονος εδοθησαν [εν] τοις Ελλ[η]σι[ν, ετ]η [Χ] . ν . . βασιλευον-

ſum, & *fabulas* de iis, qui fruges accipiebant, anni MCXXXV, regnante Athenis Erichtheo.

Ep. 15. *A quo Eumolpus Muſæi filius* myſteria exhibuit in Eleuſine, & *patris ſui* Muſæi poemata edidit, *anni MC* . . . , *regnante Athenis Erichtheo filio* Pandionis.

Ep. 16. A quo luſtratio primò facta fuit *per cædem* . . . . *anni MLXII*, regnante Athenis Pandione *filio* Cecropis.

Ep. 17. A quo in Eleuſine gymnicum *certamen proponebatur*, *anni M* . . . . *regnante Athenis Pandione filio Cecropis.*

Ep. 18. A quo *humana ſacrificia*, & Lycæa in Arcadiâ celebrata fuere, & . . . . Lycaonis dabantur *inter* Græcos, anni M . . . . . . , regnan-

32. τος Αθηνων Πανδιονος του Κεκροπος. Αφ ου κα[θαρισθεις εν Ελευσιν]ι Ηρακλης [εμυνηθη ξεν]ω[ν πρωτ]ος, [ετη Χ] . . .

33. βασιλευοντος Αθηνησιν Αιγεως. Αφ ου Αθηνησι [σπανι]ς των καρπων εγενετο, και μαντευομενοις [τοις] Αθην[αιοις Απολ]λων ην[αγκασεν

34. δικα]ς υποσχε[ι]ν, α[ς] αμ Μινως αξιωσει, ετη ΧΔΔΔΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αιγ[εως.] Αφ ου Θησ[ευς]

35. Αθηνων τας δωδεκα πολεις εις το αυτο συνωκισεν, και πολιτειαν και την δημοκρατειαν [πρωτος καθ-

36. εστηκω]ς Αθηνων, τον των Ισθμιων αγωνα εθηκε, Σινιν αποκτεινας, ετη ⊞ΗΗΗΗ⊠ΔΔΔΔΠ. Απο της Αμμον[ιας] τη[ς πρωτης, ετη ⊞ΗΗΗ

37. Η⊠]ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Θησεως.

te Athenis Pandione *filio* Cecropis.

Ep. 19. A quo *lustratus in Eleusine* Hercules *initiatus fuit hospitum primus, anni M..* regnante Athenis Ægeo.

Ep. 20. A quo Athenis *inopia* frugum contigit, & consultus ab Atheniensibus Apollo *coegit eos* pœnas subire, quascunque Minos postularet, anni MXXXI, regnante Athenis Ægeo.

Ep. 21. A quo Theseus Athenis duodecim urbes in unam civitatem collegit, & reipublicæ formam & statum popularem *cùm primus constituisset* Athenis, Isthmiorum certamen proposuit, postquam Sinin occiderat, anni DCCCCLXXXXV.

Ep. 22. *A festo Ammon dicto primùm celebrato, anni DCCCCL*XXXXII, regnante Athenis Theseo.

Αφ ου Αργειοι[σιν] Αδρα[ςος ε]βασιλευσ[ε]ν, και τον αγωνα [ε]ν [Νεμεᾳ ε]θ[εσ]αν [οι

38. Επτα,] ετη ΗΗΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΠΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Θησεως. Αφ ου οι [Ελλη]νες εις Τροιαν ε[ς]ρατευ[σαν,] ετη ΗΗΗΗΗΗΙΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθη[νων

39. Μεν]εσθεως τρεις και δεκατου ετους. Αφ ου Τροια ηλω, ετη ΗΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΔΠ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων [Μενεσθε] ως, [εικοςου και] δευτερου ετους, μηνος Θ[αρ-

40. γηλιω]νος εβδομη φθινοντος. Αφ ου Ορεςη[ς εν Σκυθ]ια των αυτο[υ μανιων ιαθη, και Α]ιγισθου θυγατρι [Ηριγ]ον[η υπερ Αι]γισθου και αυ[τῳ δικη

41. εγενετ]ο εν Αρειου Παγῳ, ην Ορεςης ενικησεν [ισων ψηφ]ων [ουσων,] ετη [Η]ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔ[Δ]ΙΙ,

Ep. 23. A quo Argivorum *Adrastus* rex fuit, & certamen in Nemeâ propofuerunt Septem Duces, anni DCCCCLXXXVII, regnante Athenis Thefeo.

Ep. 24. A quo Græci ad Trojam expeditionem fufceperunt, anni DCCCCLIV, regnante Athenis Meneftheo, anno *regni ejus* decimo tertio.

Ep. 25. A quo Troja capta fuit, anni DCCCC XLV, regnante Athenis *Menestheo*, *vicesimo* fecundo *regni ejus* anno, menfis Thargelionis die feptimo ante finem.

Ep. 26. A quo Oreftes in Scythiâ ab *insaniâ suâ liberatus fuit*, *&* Ægifthi filiæ Erigonæ *de* Ægiftho & illi *lis* interceffit in Areopago, in quâ Oreftes vicit *æqualibus numero* fuffragiis *existentibus*, anni DCCCCXLII,

βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Δημοφωντος. Αφ ου [Σαλα-

42. μινα εν] Κυπρῳ Τευκρος ῳκισεν, ετη ΠΗΗΗ ΗΔΔΔΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Δημοφωντος. Αφ ου Νη[λ]ευς ῳκισ[εν εγ Καριᾳ Μιλητον αγειρας Ιωνας, οι

43. ῳκισ]αν Εφεσον, Ερυθρας, Κλαζομενας, [Πριηνην, και Λεβεδον, Τηω,] Κολοφωνα, [Μ]υουντα, [Φωκαιαν,] Σαμον, [Χιον, και] τα [Παν]ιωνι[α] εγενετο, ετ[η

44. ΠΗΗΗ]ΔΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Με[δοντο]ς τρεις και δεκατου [ετ]ους. Αφ ου [Ησ]ιοδος ο ποιητης [εφαν]η, ετη ΠΗΠΔΔ[Δ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Με-

45. γακλους.] Αφ ου Ομηρος ο ποιητης εφανη, ετη ΠΗΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνω[ν Δ]ιογνητου.

regnante Athenis Demophonte.

Ep. 27. A quo *Salamina in* Cypro Teucer condidit, anni DCCCCXXXVIII, regnante Athenis Demophonte.

Ep. 28. A quo Neleus condidit *in Cariâ Miletum congregatis Ionibus qui condiderunt* Ephesum, Erythras, Clazomenas, *Prienen, & Lebedum, Teon,* Colophonem, Myuntem, *Phoceam,* Samum, *Chium,* & Panionia instituta fuere, anni DCCCXIII, regnante Athenis *Medonte,* anno decimo tertio.

Ep. 29. A quo Hesiodus poeta claruit, anni DCLXXX, regnante Athenis *Megacle.*

Ep. 30. A quo Homerus poeta claruit, anni DCXLIII, regnante Athenis Diogneto.

Αφ ου Φ[ει]δων ο Αργειος εδημ[ευθη, και μετρα και

46. ςαθμα] εσκευασε και νομισμα αργυρουν εν Αι-
γινη εποιησεν, ενδεκατος ων αφ Ηρακλεους ετη 𐅅ΗΔΔ
ΔΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων [Φε-

47. ρεκλε]ους. Αφ ου Αρχιας Ευαγητου δεκατος
ων απο Τημενου εκ Κορινθου ηγαγε την αποικιαν [εις]
Συρακου[σας, ετη ΗΗΗΗ𐅄ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙ,

48. βασιλευον]τος Αθηνων Αισχυλου ετους εικοςου
και ενος. Αφ ου κατ ενιαυτον ηρ[ξ]εν[ο Κ]ρ[ε]ων,
ετ[η] ΗΗΗΗΔΔ. Αφ ου [Λακεδαιμ]ο[νιοις Τ]υ[ρ-

49. ταιος συνεμαχησεν,] ετη ΗΗΗΗΔΠΙΙΙ, Αρ-
χοντος Αθηνησι Λυσι[ου.] Αφ ου Τερπανδρος ο Δερδενεος
ο Λεσβιος τους νομους του[ς π]α[λαι]ων [καιν]ουσθαι
αυλητ[ας

50. εθε]λησε, και την εμπροσθε μουσικην μετεςησεν,

Ep. 31. A quo Phidon Argivus *proſcriptus fuit*, & *menſuras atque pondera* paravit, & nummum argenteum in Ægina cudit, undecimus ab Hercule, anni DCXXXI, regnante Athenis *Pherecle*.

Ep. 32. A quo Archias Euageti *filius*, decimus a Temeno, e Corintho eduxit coloniam Syracuſas, anni CCC CXCIIII, regnante Athenis Æſchylo, anno viceſimo primo.

Ep. 33. A quo annuus Archon exſtitit primus Creon, anni CCCCXX.

Ep. 34. A quo *cum Lacedæmoniis Tyrtæus militavit*, anni CCCCXVIII, Archonte Athenis Lyſiâ.

Ep. 35. A quo Terpander Derdenei *filius* Leſbius nomos *antiquos* novare auletas voluit, & vetuſtam muſicam mutavit,

ετ[η] ΗΗΗΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Δρωπιλου. Αφ ου Α[λυαττη]ς Λυδ[ων εβα]σιλευσ[εν, ετη

51. ΗΗΗΔ]ΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αριστοκλεους. Αφ ου Σαπφω εγ Μιτυληνης εις Σικελιαν επλευσε φυγουσα, ... ολ . . . . . . θ . . . . [ετη ΗΗ ΗΔΔΠΙΙΙ,

52. Αρχον]τος Αθηνησιν μεν Κριτιου του προτερου, εν Συρακουσαις δε των [Γεω]μορων κατεχοντων την αρχην. [Αφ ου Αμφικτυονες ενικη-

53. σαν ελ]οντες Κυρραν, και ο αγων ο γυμνικος ετεθη χρηματιτης απο των λαφυρων, ετη ΗΗ[Η]ΔΔΠ ΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμω[ν]ος. Αφ ου

54. [ο στεφ]ανιτης αγων παλιν ετεθη, ετη ΗΗΗΔ [Δ]ΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Δαμασιου του δευτερου. Αφ ου εν α[πην]αις Κωμω[διαι εφορεθησαν υ-

anni CCCLXXXI, Archonte Athenis Dropilo.

Ep. 36. A quo *Alyattes* in Lydiâ regnavit, *anni CCC XLI*, Archonte Athenis Ariſtocle.

Ep. 37. A quo Sappho e Mitylene in Siciliam trajecit fugiens . . . . *anni CCCXXV*III, Archonte Athenis quidem Critiâ priore, Syracuſis autem rerum potitis Geomoris.

Ep. 38. *A quo Amphictyones vicerunt* captâ Cyrrhâ, & certamen gymnicum editum fuit pecuniarium ex ſpoliis, anni CCCXXVII, Archonte Athenis Simone.

Ep. 39. A quo coronarium certamen iterum editum fuit, anni CCCXXII, Archonte Athenis Damaſiâ ſecundo.

Ep. 40. A quo in plauſtris comœdiæ vectæ fuerunt

55. πο] των Ικαριεων, ευροντος Σουσαριωνος, και αθλον ετεθη πρωτον ισχαδων αρσιχο[ς] και οινου [αμφορευς, ετη ΗΗ . . . Αρχοντος Αθηνησι . . . . . .

56. . .] Αφ ου Πεισιςρατος Αθηνων ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΗ𐅅ΔΔΔΔΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος [Αθηνησ]ι Κ[ωμι]ου. Αφ ου Κροισος [εξ] Ασιας [εις] Δελφο[υ]ς α[πεπεμψεν,

57. ετη ΗΗ𐅅]ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Ευθυ]δημου. Αφ ου Κυρος ο Περσων βασιλευς Σαρδεις ελαβε, και Κροισον υπο [Πυθι]ης σφαλ[λομενον εζωγρησεν, ετη ΗΗ𐅅ΔΔΔΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ερξικλειδου.

58. Ην δε] και Ιππωναξ κατα τουτον ο Ιαμβοποιος. Αφ ου Θεσπις ο ποιητης [εφανη, πρωτος ος και] εδιδαξε [Τραγῳδιαν, ης αθλον ε]τεθη ο [τ]ραγος, ετη ΗΗ𐅅[ΔΔΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθ[ηνησιν

ab Icarienſibus, inventore Suſarione; & præmium poſitum fuit primum ficuum cophinus & vini *dolium*, *anni* CC . . . *Archonte Athenis* . . . . .

Ep. 41. A quo Piſiſtratus Athenis tyrannidem occupavit, anni CCLXXXXVII, Archonte Athenis *Comiâ.*

Ep. 42. A quo Crœſus *ex* Aſiâ *ad* Delphos *miſit*, *anni CCX*CII, Archonte Athenis Euthydemo.

Ep. 43. A quo Cyrus Perſarum rex Sardes expugnavit, & Crœſum a Pythiâ deceptum *vivum cepit*, *anni CC LXXX*V *Archonte Athenis Erxiclide. Vixit autem et* Hipponax hujus tempore Iambicus poeta.

Ep. 44. A quo Theſpis poeta *floruit*, *qui porrò primus* docuit *Tragœdiam*, *cujus præmium* fuit hircus, anni CCL*XXIII*, Archonte *Athenis*

59. Αλκ]αιου του προτερου. Αφ ου Δαρειος Περσων εβασιλευσε, Μαγου τελευτησαντος, ετη [ΗΗ]ꟾ[Π]Ι, Αρχοντος Αθη[νησι] . . . . . Αφ ου Αρμοδιος και [Αριςογε]ιτων απεκτε[ιναν

60. Ιππα]ρχον Πεισιςρατου Α[θηνων τυραννον], και Αθηναιοι σ[υναντς]ησαν τους Πεισιςρατιδας εκ[βαλλειν του Πελασγικ]ου τειχους, ετη ΗΗΔΔΔΔΠ III, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι

61. [Κλισθενους.] Αφ ου χοροι πρωτον ηγωνισαντο ανδρων, ον διδαξας Υπο[δι]κος Χαλκιδε[υς] ενικ[ησεν,] ετη ΗΗΔΔΔ[ΔΙΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Ι[σαγορου. Αφ ου νε[ως Αθηνας της] Ιππια[ς ιδρυσ-

62. θη] Αθηνησιν, ετη ΗΗΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Πυθοκριτου. Αφ ου εμ Μαραθωνι μαχη εγενετο

Alcæo priore.

Ep. 45. A quo Darius in Perſia regnavit, Mago defuncto, anni *CCL*VI, Archonte Athenis . . . .

Ep. 46. A quo Harmodius & Ariſtogiton interfecerunt Hipparchum Piſiſtrati *filium Athenarum tyrannum*, & Athenienſes *conſurrexerunt ut* Piſiſtratidas *ejicerent ex Pelaſgico* muro, anni CCXLVIII, Archonte Athenis *Cliſthene*.

Ep. 47. A quo chori primùm certârunt virorum, cujuſmodi primum cum docuiſſet Hypodicus Chalcidenſis, vicit, anni CCXXXXIV, Archonte Athenis Iſagora.

Ep. 48. A quo *templum Minervæ* Hippiæ *ſtructum fuit* Athenis, anni CCXXXI, Archonte Athenis Pythocrito.

Ep. 49. A quo in Marathone pugna commiſſa eſt

Αθηναιοις προς τους Περσας, [και Αρταφερνεα το]ν Δαρειου αδελ-

63. [φιδεο]ν, τον ϛρατηγον ενικων Αθηναιοι, ετη ΗΗΔΔΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθην[ησι του] δευτερου [Φαιμιππου, και] εν μαχῃ συνηγωνισατο Αισχυλος ο ποιητης

64. [ετ]ω[ν] ων ΔΔΔΠ. Αφ ου Σιμωνιδης ο Σιμωνιδου παππος του ποιητου, ποιητης ων και [αυτος Αθη]νησι, και Δαρειος τελευτᾳ, Ξερξης δε ο υιος βασιλευει, [ετη

65. ΗΗΔ]ΔΠ[Ι], Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αριϛειδου. Αφ ου Αισχυλος ο ποιητης τραγωδιᾳ πρωτον ενικησε, και Ευριπιδης ο ποιητης εγενετο, και Στησιχορος ποιητης ε[ις]

66. την Ελλαδα αφικετ]ο, ετη ΗΗΔΔΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Φιλοκρατους. Αφ ου Ξερξης την σχεδιαν

ab Athenienſibus contra Perſas, & *Artaphernem* Darii nepotem, ducem, ſuperârunt Athenienſes, anni CCXXVII, Archonte Athenis ſecundo *Phænippo*, & in prælio unà certavit Æſchylus poeta, *cum eſſet annos natus* XXXV.

Ep. 50. A quo Simonides Simonidis avus poëtæ, poeta fuit qui & *ipſe* Athenis; & Darius obiit, Xerxes verò filius *ejus* regnavit, *anni CCX*XVI, Archonte Athenis Ariſtide.

Ep. 51. A quo Æſchylus poeta tragœdiâ primùm vicit, & Euripides poeta natus fuit, & Steſichorus poeta *in* Græciam *venit*, anni CCXXII, Archonte Athenis Philocrate.

Ep. 52. A quo Xerxes navigiorum pontem

εζευξεν εν Ελλησποντῳ, και τον Αθω διωρυξε, και η εν Θερμο-

67. [πυ]λαις μαχη εγενετο, και ναυμαχια τοις Ελλησι περι Σαλαμινα προς τους Περσας, ην ενικων οι Ελληνες, ετη ΗΗΔΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Καλλιαδου. Αφ ου η εν

68. [Π]λαταιαις μαχη εγενετο Αθηναιοις προς Μαρδονιον τον Ξερξου στρατηγον, ην ενικων Αθηναιοι, και Μαρδονιος ετελευτησεν εν τη μαχη, και το πυρ ερυη[σε

69. εν Σικ]ελια περι την Αιτνιαν, ετη Η[Η]ΔΠΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Ξαντιππου. Αφ ου [Γε]λων ο Δεινομενους [Συρακουσων] ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΗΔΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Τιμοσθεν-

70. [ους. Α]φ ου Σιμωνιδης ο Λεωπρεπους ο Κειος, ο το μνημονικον ευρων, ενικησεν Αθηνησιν διδασκων, και

jun xit in Hellespont e, & Athonem perfodit, & in Thermopylis pugna commissa fuit, & pugna navalis a Græcis ad Salaminem contra Persas, in qua vicerunt Græci, anni CCXVII, Archonte Athenis Calliade.

Ep. 53. A quo ad Platæas pugna commissa fuit ab Atheniensibus contra Mardonium Xerxis ducem, in qua vicerunt Athenienses, & Mardonius occubuit in pugnâ, & ignis *defluxit in Sicilia* circa Ætnam, anni CCXVI, Archonte Athenis Xantippo.

Ep. 54. A quo Gelon Dinomenis *filius Syracusis* tyrannidem occupavit, anni CCXV, Archonte Athenis Timosthene.

Ep. 55. A quo Simonides Leoprepis *filius* Ceius, qui memorandi artem invenit, vicit Athenis docens, &

αι εικονες εϛαθησαν Αρμοδιου και Αριϛογειτονος, ετη ΗΗ[ΔΙΙΙΙ,]

71. Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Α]δειμαντου. Αφ ου Ιερων Συρακουσων ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΗΠΙ[Ι]ΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Χ[αρ]ητος. Ην δε και Επιχαρμος ο ποιητης κατα του-

72. τον. Αφ ου Σοφοκλης ο Σοφιλλου ο εκ Κολωνου ενικησε τραγῳδιᾳ, ετων ων ΔΔΠΙΙΙ, ετη ΗΗΠΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αψηφιονος. Αφ ου εν Αιγος ποταμοις ο λιθος επεσε,

73. και Σιμωνιδης ο ποιητης ετελευτησεν, βιους ετη ΙΔΙΔΔΔΔ, ετη ΗΗΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Θεαγενιδου. Αφ ου Αλεξανδρος ετελευτησεν, ο δε υιος Πε[ρ]δικ-

74. κας Μακεδονων εβασιλευει, ετη ΗΙΔΙΔΔΔΠ [ΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ευθιππου. Αφ ου Αισχυλος

ſtatuæ poſitæ fuerunt Harmodii & Ariſtogitonis, anni CCXIV, Archonte Athenis Adimanto.

Ep. 56. A quo Hiero Syracuſis tyrannidem occupavit, anni CCIX, Archonte Athenis Charete. Vixit autem & Epicharmus poeta hujus tempore.

Ep. 57. A quo Sophocles Sophilli *filius*, qui e Colono fuit, vicit tragœdiâ, cùm eſſet annos natus XXVIII, anni CCVI, Archonte Athenis Apſephione.

Ep. 58. A quo in Ægos flumen lapis cecidit, & Simonides poeta obiit, cùm vixiſſet annos XC, anni CCV, Archonte Athenis Theagenidâ.

Ep. 59. A quo Alexander obiit, filius autem illius Perdiccas apud Macedonas regnavit, anni CXCVIII, Archonte Athenis Euthippo.

Ep. 60. A quo Æſchylus

ο πο[ι]ητης βιωσας ετη ⊠ΔΠIIII ετελευτησεν εν [Γε-

75. λ]α της [Σι]κελιας, ετη Η⊠ΔΔΔΔIII, Αρχοντος Αθηνησ[ι] Καλλ[ι]ου του προτερου. Αφ ου Ευριπιδης ετων ων ΔΔΔΔIII τραγωδια πρωτον ενικησεν, ετη Η⊠Δ[ΔΠIIII,]

76. Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Διφι[λου. Η]σαν δε κατα Ευριπιδην Σωκρατης, και [Ανα]ξαγορας. Αφ ου Αρχελαος Μακεδονων εβασιλευσε Περδικκου τελευτησαντος, ετη Η[⊠ΠI,

77. Αρχ]οντος Αθηνησι Αςυφιλου. Αφ ου Διονυσιος Συρακουσων ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΔIIII, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ευκτημονος. Αφ ου Ευριπιδης βι[ωσας ετη ⊠ΔΔΠII

78. ετε]λευτησεν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΔ[III,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αντιγενους. Α[φ] ου Σο[φ]οκλης ο ποιητης

poeta, cùm vixiſſet annos LXIX, obiit in *Gela* Siciliæ, anni CXCIII, Archonte Athenis Callia primo.

Ep. 61. A quo Euripides, cùm eſſet annorum XLIII, tragœdiâ primùm vicit, anni CLXXIX, Archonte Athenis Diphilo. Vixerunt verò tempore Euripidis Socrates & Anaxagoras.

Ep. 62. A quo Archelaus in Macedoniâ regnavit, Perdiccâ defuncto, anni CLVI, Archonte Athenis Aſtyphilo.

Ep. 63. A quo Dionyſius Syracuſis tyrannidem occupavit, anni CXLIV, Archonte Athenis Euctemone.

Ep. 64. A quo Euripides, cùm *vixiſſet annos LXXVII*, obiit, anni CXLIII, Archonte Athenis Antigene.

Ep. 65. A quo Sophocles poeta,

βιωσας ετη [ΙΔΙ]ΔΔΔΔΙ ετελευτησεν, και Κυρος ανεβ[ησε επι τον αδελφον, ετη ΗΔΔΔΔΙΙ,

79. Αρχ]οντος Αθηνησι Καλλιου του Πρ.τ..ου. Αφ ου Τελεστης Σελ[ινουντιος ε]νικησεν Αθηνησιν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΠ[ΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Μικωνος. Αφ ου [επανηλθον οι

80. μετ]α Κυρου αναβαντες, και Σωκρατης φιλοσοφ[ο]ς ετελευτησε [βιους] ετη ΙΔΙΔΔ, ετη ΗΔΔΔΠ [Ι,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Λαχητος. Αφ ου Α[στυδαμας πρωτον εδιδαξεν]

81. Αθηνησιν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αριστοκρατους. Αφ ου Ξ[ανθος ο ποιητης Σαρδ]ιανος διθυραμβῳ ενικησεν Αθηνησιν, ετη Η.. [Αρχοντος Αθηνησι ....

82. Αφ] ου Φιλοξενος διθυραμβοποιος τελευτᾳ βιους ετη ΙΔΙΠ, ετη ΗΔΠΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Πυθεου.

cùm vixiſſet annos XCI, obiit, & Cyrus *invaſit fratrem ejus*, anni CXLII, Archonte Athenis Calliâ ....

Ep. 66. A quo Teleſtes *Selinuntius* vicit Athenis, anni CXXXVIII, Archonte Athenis Micone.

Ep. 67. A quo *ii redière qui cum* Cyro iverunt, & Socrates philoſophus obiit *cùm vixiſſet* annos LXX, anni CXXXVI, Archonte Athenis Lachete.

Ep. 68. *A quo Aſtydamas primùm docuit* Athenis, anni CXXXV, Archonte Athenis Ariſtocrate.

Ep. 69. A quo *Xanthus poeta Sardianus* dithyrambo vicit Athenis anni C ... *Archonte Athenis* .....

Ep. 70. *A* quo Philoxenus dithyramborum ſcriptor obiit, cùm vixiſſet annos LV, anni CXVI, Archonte Athenis Pytheâ.

Αφ ου Αναξανδριδης ο κωμ[ῳδοποιος ενικησεν Αθηνησιν, ετη ΗΔΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος]

83. Αθηνησι Καλλεου. Αφ ου Αςυδαμας Αθηνησιν ενικησεν, ετη ΗΠΙΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αςειου. Κατεκαη δε τοτε κα[ι εν ουρανῳ η μεγαλη λαμπας. Αφ ου εν Λευκτροις

84. μαχη ε]γενετο Θηβαιων και Λακεδαιμονιων, ην ενικων Θηβαιοι, ετη ΗΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Φρασικλειδου. [Κατα τουτον δε και Αλεξανδρος ο Αμυντου Μακεδονων]

85. βασιλευει. Αφ ου Στησιχορος ο Ιμεραιος ο δευτερος ενικησεν Αθηνησιν, και ῳκισθη Μεγαλοπολ[ις εν Αρκαδιᾳ, ετη ΗΠΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Δυσκινητου.]

86. Αφ ου Διονυσιος Σικελιωτης ετελευτησεν, ο δε υιος

Ep. 71. A quo Anaxandrides comicus *poeta vicit Athenis*, *anni CXIII*, *Archonte* Athenis Calleâ.

Ep. 72. A quo Aſtydamas Athenis vicit, anni CIX, Archonte Athenis Aſteio. Exarſit autem tunc & *in cœlo magnà lampas*.

Ep. 73. *A quo in Leuctris pugna* commiſſa fuit inter Thebanos & Lacedæmonios, in quâ vicerunt Thebani, anni CVII, Archonte Athenis Phraſiclide. *Hujus autem tempore Alexander Amyntæ filius in Macedoniâ* regnavit.

Ep. 74. A quo Steſichorus Himeræus ſecundus vicit Athenis, & condita fuit Megalopolis *in Arcadiâ*, *anni CVI*, *Archonte Athenis Dyſcineto*.

Ep. 75. A quo Dionyſius Siculus obiit, filius autem ejus

Διονυσιος ετυραννευσεν, και Αλε[ξα]ν[δρου τελευτησαντος Πτολεμαιος Μακεδονων

87. βασι]λευει, ετη ΗΙΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Ναυσιγενους. Αφ ου Φωκεις το εν Δελφοις [ιερον εσυλευσαν, ετη 𐅄ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθην-]

88. ησι Κηφισοδωρου. Αφ ου Τιμοθεος βιωσας ετη 𐅄ΔΔΔΔ ετελευτησεν, [ο δε Φιλιππος Αμυντου των Μα-]

89. κεδονων βασιλευει, και Αρτοξερξης ετελευτησεν· Ωχος δε ο υιος β[ασιλευει των Περσων, και] . . . .

90. . . . . . ενικησεν, ετη 𐅄ΔΔΔΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αγαθοκλε[ους. Αφ ου Αλεξανδρος ο Φιλιπ-

91. που εγε]νετο, ετη 𐅄ΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Καλλιϛ[ρατου, ... Ην δε και Αριϛοτελης ο

Dionysius tyrannidem occupavit, & *Alexandro defuncto, Ptolemæus in Macedoniâ* regnavit, anni CIV, Archonte Athenis Nausigene.

Ep. 76. A quo Phocenses Delphicum *templum spoliârunt, anni LXXXXIIII, Archonte* Athenis Cephisodoro.

Ep. 77. A quo Timotheus cum vixisset annos LXX XX obiit, *Philippus autem Amyntæ filius in Macedonia* regnavit, & Artaxerxes obiit, Ochus verò filius *ejus regnavit in Persia, &* . . . . vicit, anni LXXXX III, Archonte Athenis Agathocle.

Ep. 78. *A quo Alexander Philippi filius natus fuit*, anni LXXXXI, Archonte Athenis Callistrato . . . . *Vixit autem & Aristoteles*

92. φιλο]σοφος κατα τουτο[ν.] Αφ ου Κα . . . .

93. . . . [ετ]η ΙΔΙ . . . . Αρχοντος . . . .

philosophus hujus tempore.

Ep. A quo Ca . . . . *anni* L . . . . Archonte . . . .

Cætera desiderantur.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN order to give the English reader a proper notion of the lacunæ in this inscription, and to discriminate the assertions of the author from the conjectures of the commentators, the translator has followed the original, as closely as possible, without any regard to elegance of style.

THE

PARIAN CHRONICLE.

	Bef. Chr.
* * * * * * * I have described *preceding times*, beginning from Cecrops, the first who reigned at Athens, to *Ast*yanax, archon in Paros, and Diognetus at Athens *.	
Epoc. 1. Since Cecrops reigned at Athens, and the country was named Cecropia, before called Actica, from Actæus, a native †, 1318 years. - - -	1582
2. Since Deucalion reigned near Parnassus ‡, in Lycoria, Cecrops *reigning* at Athens, 1310 years. - - -	1574

* Diognetus was archon, Olymp. cxxix. 1. that is, bef. Chr. 264 years.

† Αυτοχθων, *autochthon*, an original inhabitant of the country.

‡ Παρα τον Παρνασσον, apud Parnassum. Lycorea, or Lycoria, was a town on the top of Parnassus. Those who were able to fly from the deluge, says Pausanias, retired ες τα ακρα, to the summits of Parnassus, and there built a city, which they called Lycorea. Pausan. l. x. c. 6. Strab. l. ix. p. 640. I do not find, that the country near Parnassus was ever distinguished by that name. Vid. Steph. Suidas, &c.

3. Since

	Bef. Chr.
3. Since the cause was *tried* at Athens between Mars and Neptune, concerning Halirrothius [the son] of Neptune, and the place was called Areopagus, 1268, Cr*ana*us reigning at Athens. - - -	1532
4. Since the deluge happened in the time of Deucalion; and Deucalion escaped the rains [and went] from Lycoria to Athens, *to Cranaus, and built the temple* of *Jupiter Olympius, and* offered sacrifices for his preservation, 1265 *years*, Cr*ana*us reigning at Athens. - - - -	1529
5. S*ince Amphi*ctyon [the son] of Deucalion reigned in Thermopylæ, and assembled *t*he people inhabiting that district, and c*al*led them Amphictyones, and [the place of council] P*ylæa*; *where* the Amphictyones still sacrifice, 1258 *ye*ars, Amphictyon reigning at Athens *. - - - -	1522
6. Since Hellen [the son] of Deuc*alion* reigned in *Phthi*otis, and they were *na*med Hellenes, who before were called Graikoi [Greeks] and *they instituted* the Panathe*næan* † agon [games] 1257 *years*, Amphictyon reigning at Athens. - -	1521

* Suidas says, ὁ τοπος, the place, where the Amphictyones assembled, and the assembly itself, were called πυλαια. Suid. in v. Πυλαγοραι. Strab. l. ix. p. 643.

It is observed by M. Goguet, that the marbles distinguish very plainly Amphictyon, the son of Deucalion, from Amphictyon, king of Athens. Goguet, Orig. of Laws, &c. b. i. c. 1. But if this be the case, the marbles are expressly contradicted by Apollodorus, who asserts, that Amphictyon, the son of Deucalion, reigned μετα Κραναον, with Cranaus, at Athens. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2.

† See note to Epoc. 10.

10. Since

Bef. Chr.

7. Since Cadmus [the son] of Agenor came to Thebes *, *according to the oracle, and* built Cadmea, 1255 years, Amphictyon reigning at Athens. - - - 1519

8 Since *Eurotas and Lacedæmon* reigned in *Laco*nia, 1252 years, Amphictyon reigning at Athens. - - - 1516

9. Since a ship *with fifty oars* sailed from Egypt *to* Greece, and was called Pentecontorus, and the daughters of Danaus . . . . *Amym*one and Ba . . . . . and Helice and Archedice, elected by the rest, *built a temple*, and sacrificed upon the shore, *in the maritime country* †, in Lindus [a city] of Rhodes, 1247 years, *Erichthonius* reig*ning at Athens*. - - - - 1511

10. *Since Erich*thonius, the first Panathenæa ‡ being celebrated, yoked [horses to] a cha-

* Diodorus and Eusebius make Danaus go into Greece, before Cadmus went in search of Europa. Diodorus having related the story of Danaus, says, μικρον δ' ὑστερον τουτων των χρονων, Καδμος, κ. τ. λ. "a short time afterwards, &c." Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 329. Our chronologer places Cadmus 8 years before Danaus.

† Επι της ακτης, εμ παρα[λι]αδι, super littus, in maritimâ regione. It is very probable, that παραλιαδι is not the word, which was originally engraved on the marbles. Παραλιας is an uncommon term; and, joined with ακτη, in this place, occasions a tautology.

‡ Panathenæa, an Athenian festival in honour of the goddess Athena, or Minerva. Apollodorus and Harpocration tell us, that it was instituted by Erichthon; for which the latter produces the authority of Hellanicus and Androtion. He adds, on the testimony of Ister the historian, that, before the time of Erichthon, this festival was called Athenæa, and not Panathenæa. But Pausanias asserts, that it did not receive the name of Panathenæa, till Theseus formed the twelve cities of Attica into one community, and ordained a common feast and sacrifice for all the united Athenians.

 Apollod.

a chariot, and ſhewed the conteſt *, and *changed the name* of Athenæa; *and the image*, of the mother of the *g*ods appeared in [the mountains of] Cybele †; and Hyagnis the Phrygian firſt invented flutes at C*elæ*næ [a city] of Phryg*ia*, *and* firſt played on the flute *the harmony c*alled Phrygian, and other nomes ‡ of the mother [of the gods] of Dionyſus, of Pan, and that of *the deities of the country, and the heroes*, 1242 years, Erichthonius, who yoked [horſes to] the chariot, reigning at Athens. - - - Bef. Chr. 1506

11. Since Minos *the* fir*ſt reigned* and built Cydonia; and iron was found in Ida, by the Idæi Dactyli Celmis a*nd Damnaneus* [1168] *years*, Pandion *reig*ning at Athens. - - 1432

12. Since Ceres coming to Athens pla*nte*d corn ‖, and *firſt ſent it to other* [countries], by

Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 6. Plut. in v. Theſei, p. 11. Harpocration in v. Παναθηναια. Pauſan. l. viii. c. 2. Schol. Ariſtoph. Nub. v. 385.

* Primùm junxit quadrigas Erichthonius. Plin. l. vii. c. 55.

† Diod. Sic. l. iii. p. 193. Απο των Κυβελων ἡ Κυβελη, à Cybelis Cybele nominata. Strab. xii. p. 852.

‡ Νομος ſignifies a tune, or a piece of muſic; and ſometimes an ode or ſong. Νομῳ τινι αδοντες, "ſinging a particular tune." Xenoph. Anab. l. v. Non antè cantare deſtitit, quàm incohatum abſolveret νομον, "he did not leave off, till he had finiſhed the piece of muſic he had before him." Suet. in v. Ner. § 20. Διεξελθειν νομον τον Ορθιον, "to ſing the Orthian ſong." Herod. l. i. c. 24. Ariſtotle propoſes this problem, "Why is the ſame word, νομοι, uſed for laws and ſongs? Is it," ſays he, "becauſe men, before they had diſcovered the art of writing, ſung their laws, that they might not forget them?" Ariſt. Prob. ſect. xix, 28. Vid. Plut. de Muſicâ.

‖ Καρπον εφυτευεν, planted fruit. Some writers ſuppoſe, that barley

	Bef. Chr.
by *Triptolemus* [the son] of Celeus and Neæra, 1145 years, Erichtheus reigning at Athens. - - - -	1409
13. Since Tripto*lemus* sowed *corn* in Rharia, called Eleusin *, 1[1]42 years, *Erichtheus* reigning at Athens. - -	1406
14. *Since Orpheus* pub*li*shed his poem [on] the rape of Proserpine †, the search of Ceres, his *descent* [to the shades], *and the fables* concerning those, who received the corn †, 1135 years, Erichtheus reigning at Athens. - - - -	1399
15. *Since Eumolpus* [the son] of *Musæ*us celebrated the mysteries in Eleusin, and publish*ed* the po*ems* of *his father M*usæus, 11 . . *years*, *Erichthe*us [the son] of Pandion, *reigning at Athens*. - - -	13 . .

ley was the first grain sown in Attica. Pharnutus asserts, that Eleusis was the place, where the use of *barley* was first discovered. Phurn. de Nat. Deor. c. 28. Pausanias likewise observes, that corn was first sown in the Rharian plain; and that the cakes offered in sacrifice to Ceres, were made of the *barley*, which grew there. Pausan. l. i. c. 38. But Apollodorus, Diodorus, and others, when they speak of the first essays of agriculture, under the direction of Ceres, use the words σιτος, πυρος, and καρπος, indiscriminately, as well as ουλαι. Apollod. l. i. c. 5. § 2. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 336.

* Eleusin.——Talis est in Græcis ratio: nam *actin* et *actis* dicunt, *delphin* et *delphis*, *Eleusin* et *Eleusis*; sed veriùs in *n* desinunt, quòd in obliquis habent, et *actinos*, *delphinos*, *Eleusinos*. Serv. Virg. Georg. l. i. 161.

† A fragment, which is cited by Pausanias, and ascribed to Homer, mentions the names of those, who received the corn, and were first initiated into the mysteries of Ceres. These were, according to that poet, Celeus, Triptolemus, Eumolpus, and Diocles. Pausan. l. ii. c. 14. Clemens Alexandrinus says, their names were Baubo, Dysaules, Triptolemus, Eumolpus, and Eubuleus. Clem. Alex. Cohort. § 2. p. 17.

	Bef. Chr.
16. Since a lustration was first performed *by slaying* . . . . 10[6]2 *years*, Pandion [the son] of Cecrops [the second] reigning at Athens. - - -	1326
17. Since the gymnic *agon* * *was instituted in* Eleusin, 1 . . . *years*, P*andion* [the son] *of Cecrops reigning at Athens*. - -	. . . .
18. Since *human sacrifice*s *and* the Lycæa were celebrated in Arcadia † and . . . . . . of Lycaon were given *among* the Gr*ee*ks, 1 . . . *yea*rs, Pandion [the son] of Cecrops reigning at Athens. - - -	. . . .
19. Since Hercules, having been pu*rified* ‡ *in Eleusi*n, *was initiated the first* of *strangers* ‖, 1 . . . *years*, Ægeus reigning at Athens. - - - -	. . . 6
20. Since a *scarcity* of corn happened at Athens, and *Apol*lo being consulted by *the* Athen*ians* ob*liged them* to undergo *the penalti*es, wh*ich* Minos § should require, 1031 years, *Æ*g*eus* reigning at Athens.	1295

21. Since

* Αγων, contest, exercises or games.

† Τα Λυκαια, an Arcadian festival instituted by Lycaon, in honour of Jupiter, celebrated with games, and a human sacrifice. Εθυσε τε βρεφος, immolavit infantem. Pausan. l. viii. c. 2.

‡ Hercules underwent a purgation for killing the centaur. Apollod. l. ii. c. 5. § 12.

‖ Ην δε ουκ εξον ξενοις τοτε μυεισθαι. At verò externis ad ea sacra tunc admitti non licebat. Apollod. ibid.

§ The author of the Chronicle supposes, that there were two kings of Crete of the name of Minos. See Epoc. 11. Abbé Banier maintains the same opinion, and specifies several distinguishing circumstances in the history of these two princes. According to this hypothesis, the former was the celebrated legislator, a pacific monarch, the son of Jupiter, or rather of Asterius, and the father of Lycastus.

Bef. Chr.

21. Since *Theseus* incorporated the twelve cities of Attica * into one [community] and *having first established* a civil constitution and a popular government † at Athens; he instituted the Isthmian games, after he had slain Sinis ‡, 995 years. - - 1259

22 From the *first* [celebration of the festival called] Ammon, 992 *years*, Theseus reigning at Athens. - - - 1256

23. Since Adra*stus* reign*ed* over the Argiv*es*, and *the seven* [commanders] *in*st*itut*ed the games *in Nemea*, 987 years, Theseus reigning at Athens. - - - 1251

24. Since the *Gree*ks *undertook their* expedit*ion* to Troy, 954 years, *Men*estheus reigning at Athe*ns*, in the thirteenth year [of his reign]. - - - 1218

25. Since Troy was taken, 945 years, *Menesthe*us reigning at Athens, in the [twenty-]second ‖ year [of his reign] on the

Lycastus. The latter was of an ambitious and enterprizing character; the grandson of the former, and the father of Molus, Deucalion, Androgeus, Glaucus, Phædra, and Ariadne. Banier, Mythol. vol. iii. p. 514. Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 263.

* The twelve cities of Attica were Cecropia, Tetrapolis, Epacria, Decelea, Eleusis, Aphydna, Thoricus, Brauron, Cytherus, Sphettus, Cephissia, and Phalerus. Theseus, it is said, collected them, εις μιαν πολιν, into one city, which was Athens. Strab. l. ix. p. 609. Pausan. l. viii. c. 2. Ille vicatim dispersos cives suos, in unam urbem contraxit. Val. Max. l. v. c. 3.

† Πολιτειαν και την δημοκρατιαν, i. e. πολιτειαν δημοκρατικην. Maittaire, Marm. Arund. p. 650.

‡ Plut. in v. Thesei, p. 4. Apollod. l. iii. c. 15. § 2.

‖ The siege of Troy commenced in the thirteenth year of Menestheus; consequently the destruction of that city could not be in the

Bef. Chr.

the twenty-fourth day of the month *Thargelion*. - - - - 1209

26. Since Orestes *in Scythia* was *freed from* his *madness*, and *a cause* between him and *Erigone*, the daughter of Ægisthus, *concerning* Ægisthus, was *tri*ed in Areopagus, which Orestes gained, *the votes being equal*, [942] years, Demophon reigning at Athens. - - - - 1206

27. Since Teucer built *Salamis in Cyprus*, 938 years, Demophon reigning at Athens. - - - - 1202

28. Since Ne*l*eus bui*lt** *Miletus in Caria, having collected the Ionians*, who *bu*ilt Ephesus, Erythræ, Clazomene, P*riene, and Lebedus, Teos*, Colophon, *M*yus, *Phocea*, Samos, *Chios*; *and* the *Pan*ionia † were instituted, [813] yea*rs*, Me*don* reigning at Athens, in the thirteenth *ye*ar [of his reign]. - - 1077

29. Since *He*siod the poet *flourished* 680 years, *Megacles reigning at Athens*. - 944

the second, as it is stated in the inscription. Quadratarii incuriâ omissum est proculdubiò heic εικοςου και, ita ut annus Menesthei vigesimus secundus ab autore signatus fuerit. Seld. p. 85.

* Homer tells us, that Miletus was inhabited at the time of the Trojan war.

Οἱ Μιλητον εχον ———

Qui Miletum tenebant. Il. ii. 868.

But Strabo, on the authority of Ephorus, informs us, that Neleus built a new city, at a distance from the old one, which he likewise called Miletus. Strab. l. xiv. p. 941.

† A festival, celebrated by a concourse of people from all the cities of Ionia.

30. Since

	Bef. Chr.
30. Since Homer the poet flourished 643 years, *Diognetus* reigning at Athens. -	907
31. Since Pheidon the Argive was proscribed, and made *measures and weights*, and coined silver money in Ægina, being the eleventh from Hercules, 631 years, *Pherecles* reigning at Athens. - -	895
32. Since Archias [the son] of Euagetus, being the tenth from Temenus, conducted a colony from Corinth *to* Syracuse, [494] years, Æschylus *reigning* at Athens, in the twenty-first year [of his reign]. - -	758
33. Since Creon was archon for the year *, 420 years †. - - -	684

34. Since

* In this epocha the inscription is imperfect. Palmerius, Marsham, Prideaux, Maittaire, and Chandler, fill up the lacunæ in this manner: Αφ' ου κατ' ενιαυτον ηρ[ξ]εν [ὁ Κ]ρ[ε]ων. But the author of the Chronicle never uses the prepositive article ὁ before proper names. Perhaps the original expression might have been, ηρξεν ὁ αρχων, "the archon governed."

Κατ' ενιαυτον generally signifies quotannis, singulis annis, annually, or year by year; and, in this acceptation, it is improperly applied to an archon, who was in office only one year.

This phrase however, if the passage be not an interpolation, is used by Thucydides in the sense, in which it is employed by the author of the Chronicle. Themistocles, says that historian, persuaded the Athenians to finish the Piræus; "for it was begun before this, during that year, in which he himself was chief magistrate at Athens:" υπηρκτο δ' αυτου προτερον επι της εκεινου αρχης, ης κατ' ενιαυτον Αθηναιοις ηρξε. Ejus enim *pars* ædificari prius est cœpta, quo tempore ipse, annuum magistratum gerens, Athenis præfuit. Thucyd. l. i. § 93.

Dodwell endeavours to prove, that Themistocles was archon, and began the fortifications of the Piræus in the year 481, the year before the coming of Xerxes. But it cannot be proved by any good

† J. Per. 4031. bef. Chr. 683. Corsin.

Bef. Chr.

34. Since *Tyrtæus joined the army* * *of the Lacedemonians* [against the Messenians] 418 years, Lysi*as* † being archon at Athens. - 682

35. Since Terpander [the son] of Derdeneus the Lesbian, *dire*cted the flute-pl*ayers* to *re*form the nomes of the *ancien*ts, and changed the old music, 381 yea*rs*, Dropilus ‡ being archon at Athens. - - - 645

36. Since A*lyatte*s *reigned over* the Lyd*ians*, [34]1 *years*, Aristocles being archon at Athens. - - - 605

37. Since Sappho sailed from Mitylene to Sicily, flying .... [328] *years*, Critias ‖ the first *being arch*on at Athens; the *Ge*omori possessing the government in Syracuse. - 592

38. *Since the Amphictyones obtained a victory, having ta*ken Cyrrha §, and a gymnic agon

good authority, that Themistocles, the celebrated commander, was ever the archon eponymus. Admitting, that he was an inferior magistrate, in some preceding year, we do not find, that the Piræus was fortified, till the year 477, when Adimantus was archon. Diodorus, C. Nepos, Plutarch, Pausanias, and several other writers, relate, that this work was undertaken AFTER the conclusion of the Persian war. Diod. l. xi. p. 32. C. Nep. in v. Themist. c. 6. Plut. in v. Themist. p. 121. Pausan. l. i. c. 2.

I am therefore inclined to think, that the foregoing passage in Thucydides is, as I have already intimated, an interpolation.

* Συνεμαχησεν, cum Lacedæmoniis militavit.—Tyrtæus, a lame, crack-brained poet, was sent by the Athenians to command the Spartan army.

† Lysias archon. J. P. 4033. bef. Chr. 681. Corsin.

‡ Dropilus archon. J. P. 4070. bef. Chr. 644. Id.

‖ Critias archon. J. P. 4118. bef. Chr. 596.—In marmore 332 scribendum esse putaverim. Id.

§ Cirrha, a town in Phocis, near the bay of Corinth. The inhabitants had wasted the territory of Delphi, and besieged the city,

Bef. Chr.

agon was celebrated, rewards being allotted out of the spoils, [3]27 years, Simon * being archon at Athens. - - - 591

39. Since [the Pythian] games were again celebrated, in which the conqueror received *a crown*, 3[22] years, Damasias the second † being archon at Athens. - - 586

40. Since come*dies were carried* in carts *by* the Icarians ‡, Susarion being the inventor, and the first prize proposed was a bask*et* of figs, and *a small vessel* of wine, 2.. *years*, ... being archon at Athens. - - 57.

41. Since Pisistratus became tyrant || at Athens,

from a desire of seizing the riches, contained in the temple of Apollo. Plut. in v. Solonis, p. 83.

* Simon sive Simonides archon. J. P. 4124. bef. Chr. 590. Corsin.

† Damasias II. archon. J. P. 4129. bef. Chr. 585. Id.

‡ Icaria or Icarius, a little borough, or, as Bentley calls it, "a country parish," in Attica. Athen. l. ii. p. 40. Dissert. on Phal. § 8. p. 147.

|| The word τυραννος, tyrant, among the Greeks, signified a person, who had by any means acquired a sovereign authority in a republican state, though he afterwards exercised his authority with justice and virtue. This was the case of Pisistratus, Gelo, and his brother Hiero. Some were even raised to the dignity of tyrant, by a voluntary decree of the people. Plutarch mentions particularly Tynnondas thus elected by the Eubœans, and Pittacus by the Mitylenæans; and he adds, that the Athenians would have thus elected Solon. Plut. De his qui serò, &c. p. 551. Id. in v. Solonis, p. 85.

The word τυραννις, or τυραννος, does not occur in the poems of Homer or Hesiod, and probably was not used in their time. It is employed in a favourable sense by Euripides, in the Supplices; by Aristophanes, who calls Jupiter, θεων τυραννος, Nub. act. i. sc. 6; by Sophocles, in Oedipus Tyrannus; by Plato, in his Αντεραςαι, § 8; by Æschines, in the following passage: τρεις εισι πολιτειαι . . . τυραν-

 νις,

Athens, 297 years, *Comias* * being archon | Bef. Chr.
at Athens. - - - 561

42. Since Crœsus *sent* [ambassadors] *out of* Asia *to* Delphi, [2]92 *years, Euthydemus* being archon at Athens. - - 536

43 Since Cyrus king of Persia took Sardes, and *apprehended* Crœsus, *deceived* by the *Pythia*, [285] *years, Erxiclides* † *being archon at Athens.* At this time *lived* Hipponax, the Iambic poet. - - - 549

44. Since Thespis the poet *flourished, the first who* exhibited ‡ *tragedy*, for which a goat

νις, και ολιγαρχια, και δημοκρατια. Orat. in Ctesiph. init. and frequently by the Roman writers. See Virg. Æn. vi. 266. Hor. l. iii. od. 17.

* Comias archon, J. P. 4154. bef. Chr. 560. Corsin.

† Erxiclides archon, J. P. 4166. bef. Chr. 548. Id.

‡ Εδιδαξε, docuit. Δραμα διδασκειν, signifies to publish, exhibit, or act a play. This phrase was applied to the poets, who wrote for the stage. Αςυδαμας δ' ὁ τραγῳδιογραφος τοτε πρωτον εδιδαξεν. Sub hoc tempus Astydamas, tragœdiarum scriptor, primum docere cœpit. Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 270. Θεσπις εδιδαξεν, Thespis docuit. Suidas. Σοφοκλης εδιδαξε δραματα, Sophocles docuit fabulas. Id. The authors themselves were called διδασκαλοι, teachers: ιδιως διδασκαλους λεγουσι τους ποιητας των διθυραμβων, η των κωμῳδιων, η των τραγῳδιων, peculiariter vocant διδασκαλους ipsos dithyramborum, aut comœdiarum, aut tragœdiarum poetas. Harpocration. Suidas. The Latin writers adopted this mode of expression. Livius, qui primus fabulam docuit. Cic. de Clar. Orat. § 72. Cum Thyestem fabulam docuisset, mortem obiit Ennius. Ibid. § 78. Cum Orestem fabulam doceret Euripides. Cic. Tusc. l. iv. § 63. Epist. ad Attic. l. vi. 1. De Senect. c. 14. Hor. de Art. Poet. ver. 288. A. Gell. l. xvii. 21. Casaubon gives the following reason for this phrase: "Studiorum ea fuit quondam ratio, ut maxima eruditionis pars in dramaticorum poetarum, ac præsertim comicorum, lectione et intelligentiâ poneretur. Inde puriorem Hellenismum, inde notitiam eorum, quæ in republicâ erant gesta, inde vitam & mores priorum

goat was *appointed as the prize*, 2[73] years, — Bef. Chr.
Alcæus the first being archon at *Athens* *. - 537

45. Since Darius † reigned over the Persians, Magus being dead, [2]5[6] years, . . . being archon at Athens. - - - 520

46. Since Harmodius and *Aristogiton* slew *Hipparchus* [the son] of Pisistratus, *the tyrant of Athens*, and the Athenians *conspired* to *expel* the Pisistratidæ from [their retreat within] *the Pelasgic* wall, 248 years, *Clisthenes* ‡ being archon at Athens. - - 512

47. Since choruses of men first contended, [and] Hypodicus the Chalcidian, having taught ‖ one [of them] gained the victory, 24[4] years, *Isagoras* being archon at Athens. - - - - - 508

48. Since *the temple of Minerva* Hippia §

morum civitatis Athenienfium hauriebant." Cafaub. in Athen. l. vi. c. 7.

* Alcæus I. archon. J. P. 4178. bef. Chr. 536. Corfin.

† Darius began his reign, J. P. 4193. bef. Chr. 521. Id. Petav. Doct. Temp. l. x. c. 19. Newt. Chron.

‡ Clifthenes archon. J. P. 4205. bef. Chr. 509. Corfin.

‖ Διδαξας. Plut. in v. Themift. p. 114. vid. Epoc. 44. note ‡.— Χοροδιδασκαλοι, qui choros docuerunt, nempe mufices periti. Taylor, Com. ad Marm. Sandv. p. 72. Demofth. c. Midiam. p. 47. edit. 1743. Plut. in v. Arift. init.

§ Minerva equeftris. Paufan. l. i. c. 30. Harpocration. Suidas. The application of this mutilated paffage to Minerva Hippia is ingenious; yet it is very probable, that it relates to Hippias, the brother of Pififtratus, who was expelled from Athens, and as fome writers affert, was flain at the battle of Marathon. Cic. Epift. ad Attic. l. ix. 10. Juft. l. ii. c. 9. Tertul. adv. Gentes, c. 46. Or, as others tell us, died afterwards in Lemnos. Suid. in v. Ἱππιας.—Vid. Herod. l. vi. § 107, 108. Thucyd. l. vi. § 59.

was built at Athens, 231 years, Pythocritus * being archon at Athens. - - - Bef. Chr. 495

49. Since the battle at Marathon † was fought by the Athenians against the Persians, *and* the Athenians defeated *Artaphernes*, *the* nep*hew* ‡ of Darius, the commander [of the Persian forces], 227 years, *Phænippus* ‖ *the* second being archon at Athens; *and* Æschylus the poet was engaged in the action, being [then] 35 *years* [of age]. - - - - - 491

50. Since Simonides, the grandfather of Simonides the poet, *he* also being a poet, [dies] at *Athe*ns; and Darius dies, and Xerxes *his* son reigns, [226] *years*, Aristides § being archon at Athens. - 490

51. Since Æschylus the poet first gained the victory in tragedy, and Euripides the poet was born, and Stesichorus the poet *went into* Greece, 222 years, Philocrates ¶ being archon at Athens. - - - 486

52. Since Xerxes formed a bridge of boats on the Hellespont, and cut [a navigable canal] through Athos, and the battle was fought in Thermo*py*læ, and the sea-fight by the Greeks at Salamis, against the Persians,

* Pythocritus archon. J. P. 4220. bef. Chr. 494. Corsin.

† Corsini places the battle at Marathon in the year bef. Chr. 490. Quum Salaminia pugna die 20 Boëdromionis, anno 1. Olymp. LXXV. contigerit, Marathonia clades 6 ejusdem Boëdromionis mensis dicti anni 3 Olymp. LXXII. certissime ascribi debet. Corsini Fast. Attic. vol. iii. p. 150.

‡ Ἀδελφιδέον. Herod. l. vi. §. 94.

‖ Phænippus archon. J. P. 4224. bef. Chr. 490. Corsin.

§ Aristides archon. J. P. 4225. bef. Chr. 489. Id.

¶ Philocrates archon. J. P. 4229. bef. Chr. 485. Id.

in

in which the Greeks were victorious, 217 years, Calliades * being archon at Athens. - Bef. Chr. 481

53. Since the battle at *Platææ* was fought by the Athenians against Mardonius, Xerxes's general, in which the Athenians conquered, and Mardonius fell in the battle; and [torrents of liquid] fire flow*ed in Sic*ily round Ætna, [2]16 years, Xanthippus † being archon at Athens. - - - 480

54. Since *Ge*lon [the son] of Dinomenes became tyrant *of Syracuse*, 215 years, Timosthen*es* ‡ being archon at Athens. - 479

55. Since Simonides [the son] of Leoprepes, the Cean, who invented the art of memory ‖, teaching [a chorus] at Athens, gained the victory §; and the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton were erected, 2[14] years, *A*dimantus ¶ being archon at Athens. - - - - 478

56. Since Hiero became tyrant of Syra-

* Calliades archon. J. P. 4234. bef. Chr. 480. Corsin.

† Xanthippus archon. J. P. 4235. bef. Chr. 479. Id.

‡ Timosthenes archon. J. P. 4236. bef. Chr. 478. Id.

‖ Simonidem primum ferunt artem memoriæ protulisse. Cic. de Orat. l. ii. § 84. Artem memoriæ primus ostendisse dicitur Simonides. Quint. l. xi. c. 2. Plin. l. vii. c. 24.

§ Ενικησεν Αθηνησιν διδασκων. Bentley thinks, these words relate to the teaching of *a chorus*, and translates the passage in this manner: "Simonides, the son of Leoprepes the Cean, that found the art of memory, got the prize at Athens, as teacher of a chorus, when Adimantus was archon." Dissert. on Phal. p. 29, 30.

Plutarch mentions a victory, which Simonides obtained by teaching a chorus: Ειγε Σιμωνιδης μεν εν γηρα χορους ενικα. Siquidem senex Simonides choris victoriam reportavit. Plut. Ans. eni, &c. p. 785. Val. Max. l. viii. c. 7. § 13.

¶ Adimantus archon. J. P. 4237. bef. Chr. 477. Corsin.

cuse,

	Bef. Chr.
cuse, 20[9] years, Chares * being archon at Athens: Epicharmus the poet lived at this time. - - - -	473
57. Since Sophocles [the son] of Sophillus, who was of Colonus †, gained the victory in tragedy, being 28 years of age, 206 years, Apsephion ‡ being archon at Athens.	470
58. Since the stone fell in Ægos-potamos, and Simonides the poet died, having lived 90 years, 205 years, Theagenidas ‖ being archon at Athens. - -	469
59. Since Alexander died, and his son Perdiccas reigns over the Macedonians, 19[8] years, Euthippus § being archon at Athens. - - -	462
60. Since Æschylus the poet, having lived 69 years, died at *Gela*, in *Sicily*, 193 years, Callias the first ¶ being archon at Athens.	457
61. Since Euripides, being 43 years of age, first gained the victory in tragedy, 1[79] years, Diphilus ** being archon at Athens. Socrates and *Anaxagoras* lived in the time of Euripides. - - -	443
62. Since Archelaus reigned over the Macedonians, Perdiccas being dead, 1[56] years, Astyphilus being *archon* at Athens.	420

* Chares archon. J. P. 4242. bef. Chr. 472. Corsin.

† Colonus, about ten stadia from Athens. Thucyd. l. viii. § 67. Cic. de Fin. l. v. c. 1.

‡ Apsephion archon. J. P. 4245. bef. Chr. 469. Corsin.

‖ Theagenides archon. J. P. 4246. bef. Chr. 468. Id.

§ Euthippus archon. J. P. 4253. bef. Chr. 461. Id.

¶ Callias I. archon. J. P. 4258. bef. Chr. 456. Id.

** Diphilus archon. J. P. 4272. bef. Chr. 442. Id.

63. Since

Bef. Chr.

63. Since Dionysius became tyrant of Syracuse, 144 years, Euctemon being archon at Athens. - - - - 408

64. Since Euripides, having *lived seventy-seven years*, died, 14[3] years, Antigenes being archon at Athens. - - 407

65. Since Sophocles the poet, having lived *ninety*-one years, died; and Cyrus *went up* [into Persia] *against his brother* *, 142 years, Callias the first † being *archon* at Athens. - 406

66. Since Telestes ‡ the *Selinuntian gained* the prize at Athens, 13[8] years, Micon being archon at Athens. - - 402

67. Since *those returned*, who went up *with* Cyrus [into Persia] and Socrates the philosopher died, *having lived* 70 years, 13[6] years, Laches being archon at Athens. - 400

68. Since *Astydamas first taught* at Athens, 135 years, Aristocrates being archon at Athens. - - - 399

69. Since *Xanthus, a poet of Sardes*, gained the victory at Athens in dithyrambics, 1 . . years, . . . being archon at Athens. - . . .

70 *Since* Philoxenus, a writer of dithy-

* Κυρος ανεβ[ησε επι τον αδελφον]. These four letters, ανεβ . . . *apparently* refer to the celebrated *Anabasis* of the younger Cyrus.

Ανεβησε or αναβαντες, epoc. 67. is a form of expression very common among the Greek writers, when they speak of going up to a metropolis. Εις την Ρωμην αναβαινουσι. Jos. Antiq. l. xx. 7. Αναβαινει ες Σουσα. Herod. l. vii. § 136. Vid. Matth. xx. 17, 18. Mark, x. 32, 33. Luke, x. 30. John, v. 1. vii. 8. Κυρου Αναβασις. Xenoph. Αλεξανδρου Αναβασις. Arrian.

† Του πρ . τ . ου should rather be του δευτερου, the second. Corsin. Fast. Attic. vol. iii. p. 260.

‡ Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 273.

rambics, dies, having lived 55 years, 116 — Bef. Chr.
years, Pytheas being archon at Athens. - 380

71. Since Anaxandrides the comic *poet gained the victory at Athens*, [113] *years*, Calleas *being archon* at Athens. - - 377

72. Since Astydamas gained the victory at Athens, 109 years, Asteius being archon at Athens. Then *also a great light* * blazed *in the sky*. - - - 373

73. *Since the battle was fought at Leuctra* between the Thebans and the Lacedæmonians, in which the Thebans conquered, 107 years, Phrasiclides being archon at Athens. *At this time Alexander* [the son] *of Amyntas* reigns *over the Macedonians*. - 371

74 Since Stesichorus, the Himerian, the second [of that name] gained the victory at Athens, and Megalopol*is in Arcadia* was built, [106] *years*, *Dyscinetus being archon at Athens*. - - - - 370

75. Since Dionysius the Sicilian died, and his son Dionysius became tyrant, and Alex*ander being dead*, *Ptolemy reigns over the*

* Ἡ μεγαλη λαμπας.—This phenomenon is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus; but is said to have happened the year afterwards, Olymp. CII. 1. bef. Chr. 372. Ὠφθη μεν γαρ κατα τον ουρανον επι πολλας νυκτας λαμπας μεγαλη καομενη, απο του σχηματος ονομασθεισα πυρινη δοκις. Ingens enim fax in cœlo multis noctibus ardens apparuit, quæ propter figuram iguea trabs appellata fuit. Diod. Sic. l. xv. p. 365. Aristotle tells us, that in the archonship of Aristæus, μεγας αστηρ εφανη, magna stella apparuit. Meteor. l. i. c. 6. Corsini thinks, that Aristæus should be Asteius; and that the author of the Chronicle, Diodorus, and Aristotle allude to the same phenomenon. The δοκις πυρινη, ignea trabs, or fiery beam, was undoubtedly the tail of a comet.

Macedonians,

	Bef. Chr.
Macedonians, 104 years, Nausigenes being archon at Athens. - - -	368
76. Since the Phocæans *plundered the temple* of Delphi, [94] *years*, Cephisodorus *being archon at Athens*. - -	358
77. Since Timotheus, having lived 90 years, died, *and Philip* [the son] *of Amyntas* reigns *over the Macedonians*, and Artaxerxes died; and Ochus his son *reigns over the Persians, and* .... gained the victory, 93 years, Agathocles being archon at Athens. - - - -	357
78. *Since Alexander* [the son] *of Philip was born* *, 91 years, Callistratus being archon at Athens: *Aristotle the philosopher* lived at that *time*. - - -	355
79. Since Calippus, *having slain Dion, became tyrant of Syracuse*, [90] *years*, *Diotimus being* archon *at Athens*. - -	354

* * * * * * * * * *

* Plutarch, Justin, and other writers, inform us, that Alexander was born at the time of the celebration of the Olympic games. The birth of Alexander therefore should have been placed in the preceding year, namely, the first year of the CVI Olympiad. Plut. in. v. Alex. p. 666. Just. l. xii. c. 16. Eusebius is guilty of the same error. Chron. p. 136.

A DISSERTATION ON THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

CHAP. I.

THE Parian Chronicle, engraved on a marble tablet of considerable extent, is supposed to have been written 264 years before the Christian æra *. In its perfect state, it contained a chronological detail of the principal events of Greece, during a period of 1318

* Bef. Chr. 263 years, according to Selden, Prideaux, &c.—An. J. P. 4450, bef. Chr. 264, according to Corsini and Taylor. Fasti Attici, tom. iv. p. 88. Marm. Sandv. p. 5.—In the fourth year of the CXXVIII Olympiad, bef. Chr. 265 or 264, according to Sir Isaac Newton. Chron. p. 47.

All the dates in this Dissertation refer to the commencement of the Christian æra, according to the COMMON computation. But it must be observed, that, in many cases, it is difficult, if not impossible, to adjust the Olympic year to the year before Christ; because the former began περι τας τροπας θερινας, about the summer solstice, and comprehended part of two Julian years.

years, beginning with Cecrops, before Chriſt 1582 years, and ending with the archonſhip of Diognetus, bef. Chr. 264. But the chronicle of the laſt ninety years is loſt; ſo that the part now remaining ends at the archonſhip of Diotimus, 354 years before the birth of Chriſt; and in this fragment the inſcription is at preſent ſo much corroded and effaced, that the ſenſe can only be diſcovered by very learned and induſtrious antiquaries, or, more properly ſpeaking, ſupplied by their CONJECTURES.

The date of the Chronicle coincides with the twenty-firſt year of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, the ſplendid age of the Poëtarum Pleias *; of Lycophron, Theocritus, Callimachus, Aratus, &c. the reign in which chronologers uſually place the Seventy Interpreters †, Pſeudo-Ariſteas, Manetho, and others.

The Chronicle, which is the ſubject of this enquiry,

* Authors are not agreed about the names of theſe poets. The ſcholiaſt to Hephæſtion makes this poetical conſtellation conſiſt of the following tragic writers; Homerus the ſon of Myro, Soſitheus, Lycophron, Alexander Ætolus, Æantides, Soſiphanes, and Philiſcus or Philicus. Hephæſt. Schol. p. 93. edit. 1553. Their names are mentioned again, with ſome variation, ibid. p. 32. Tzetzes includes in the liſt of theſe poets Lycophron, Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Æantides or Apollonius Rhodius, Philicus, and Homerus tragicus. Tzetzes de Gen. Lycoph. edit. 1601.

Saxius and others place the Poëtarum Pleias in the year bef. Chr. 277; yet it is certain, that all the poets above mentioned did not flouriſh at the ſame time. Gerald. Dial. iii. p. 330. Voſſ. de Poet. Græc. c. 8. p. 64. Id. de Hiſt. Græc. l. ii. c. 12. p. 74. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 19. vol. i. p. 688.

† Bef. Chr. 277. Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 38. The hiſtory of the tranſlation of the Bible by the ſeventy-two elders, as related by Ariſteas, is A CONTEMPTIBLE FICTION. Prideaux ſays: "No Ariſteas, or heathen Greek, but ſome Helleniſtical Jew, under his name, was the author of that book." Ibid. p. 50. Hodius de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

and

and many other relics of antiquity, were purchased in Asia Minor, in Greece, or in the islands of the Archipelago, by Mr. William Petty, who in the year 1624 * was sent by the Earl of Arundel †, for the purpose of making such collections for him in the East. They were brought into England about the beginning of the year 1627, and placed in the gardens belonging to Arundel-house in London, the site of which is now occupied by Arundel, Norfolk, Surrey, and Howard Streets, in the Strand.

Soon after their arrival they excited a general curiosity, and were viewed by many inquisitive and learned men; among others, by Sir Robert Cotton, who went immediately to Selden, and entreated him to exert his abilities

* "I heare your grace hath written by one Mr. Petty, that is arriued at Smirna, ymployed by my lord of Arundell to buy books and antiquities." Letter from Sir T. Roe to archbishop Abbot, Dec. 9-19, 1624. Roe's Negot. Let. 229. p. 320.

† THOMAS, the son of Philip Howard, earl of Arundel, was born in 1592. In 1603, he was restored to all the titles of honour, which his father lost by his attainder; and also to the dignity of earl of Surrey, &c. In 1613, he went into Italy; but returned the next year. In 1621, he was constituted earl marshal of England. In 1627, he obtained the Parian marbles, which were sent by Mr. Petty. In Feb. 1641-2, he embarked for Italy. In 1644, he was created earl of Norfolk. He died at Padua, Oct. 4, 1646. This excellent nobleman was a great favourer of arts and learning. His designs, paintings, statues, &c. were numerous and valuable, and collected, at a great expence, from various parts of Europe and Asia.

He was succeeded in his estate and honours by his son HENRY Howard, who died 1652, and left nine sons, THOMAS, HENRY, Philip, Charles, Talbot, Bernard, Esme; and three daughters. Thomas was restored to the title of duke of Norfolk in 1664. Afterwards traveling into Italy, he died at Padua, unmarried, Dec. 1, 1677, whereby his honours and estate descended to his brother HENRY; of whom a farther account will be given in a subsequent note.

abilities in explaining the Greek inſcriptions. Selden readily complied with his requeſt; but deſired the aſſiſtance of their common friends, Patrick Young, or, as he ſtyled himſelf in Latin, Patricius Junius, and Richard James *.

The next morning, theſe gentlemen met in Arundel-gardens, and commenced their operations, by cleaning and examining the marble, containing the league, which the cities of Smyrna and Magneſia entered into, in favour of Seleucus Callinicus, king of Syria. Afterwards, they proceeded to the Parian Chronicle, and other inſcriptions.

The following year Selden publiſhed a ſmall volume in quarto, including twenty-nine Greek, and ten Latin inſcriptions, copied from the marbles, with a tranſlation and a commentary, under this title:

Marmora Arundelliana; ſive ſaxa Græcè inciſa, ex venerandis priſcæ Orientis gloriæ ruderibus, auſpiciis et impenſis herois illuſtriſſimi, Thomæ, comitis Arundelliæ et Surriæ, comitis mareſcalli Angliæ, pridem vindicata, & in ædibus ejus hortiſque cognominibus, ad Thameſis ripam, diſpoſita.

* Patrick Young was librarian to James the Firſt, and Charles the Firſt. He was a man of diſtinguiſhed learning; and, among other things, publiſhed,

Clementis ad Corinthios Epiſtola prior, Gr. et Lat. cum interpretatione & notis, 4to. Oxon. 1633; and, in the ſame volume, Fragmentum Epiſtolæ ſecundæ, Græcè.

Catena Græcorum Patrum in Jobum, Gr. & Lat. fol. Lond. 1637.

He died in 1652, in the ſixty-ninth year of his age.

Richard James was born at Newport, in the Iſle of Wight, and was fellow of Corpus Chriſti College, in Oxford. In 1636, he publiſhed an Engliſh tranſlation of Minucius Felix, which he dedicated "to Lady Cotton, wife of Sir Robert Cotton, of Conington." He was likewiſe the author of ſeveral ſermons, &c. He died, Dec. 7, 1638.

Accedunt

Accedunt inſcriptiones aliquot veteris Latii, ex locupletiſſimo ejuſdem vetuſtatis theſauro ſelectæ: Auctariolum item aliundè ſumtum.

Publicavit et commentariolos adjecit
Joannes Seldenus, J. C.

"Ipſo rore mihi ſeges eſt, quo gramen onagris."
Prudent. [*in Sym.* v. 812.]

Londini, typis & impenſis Guilielmi Staneſbeii, MDC XXVIII. Some copies have, Apud Johannem Billium typographum, MDCXXIX.

In the turbulent reign of Charles the Firſt, and the ſubſequent uſurpation, Arundel-houſe was often deſerted by the illuſtrious owners; and, in their abſence, ſome of the marbles, which were depoſited in the gardens, were defaced or broken; and others either ſtolen, or uſed for the ordinary purpoſes of architecture *.

This appears to have been the fate of the collection in general. With reſpect to the chronological marble, we find, that during the civil wars, it was moſt unfortunately broken and defaced. The upper part, containing almoſt half of the inſcription, is ſaid to have been worked up in repairing a chimney in Arundel-houſe. But a copy of it has been luckily preſerved by Selden. The fragment now remaining begins with theſe words: ——εσκευασε, και νομισμα. l. 46. epoc. 31.

In the year 1667, the Hon. Henry Howard †, grandſon

* Hæc tamen vix ultra dimidiam partem eorum conficiunt, quæ inſigniſſimus Arundelliæ comes collegerat; cætera, cùm tempore nuperrimi belli civilis incendii, in hortis Arundellianis Londini, pulſis inde dominis, diu neglecta jacuerint, aut furtim ſurrepta, aut ſervorum negligentiâ corrupta, aut à lapicîdis ad reficiendas ædes adhibita, in magnum rei literariæ damnum, amittuntur. Prid. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. ix.

† HENRY HOWARD was the ſecond ſon of Henry earl of Arundel above mentioned. He was born in 1628. In 1664, he ſet out for

son of the first collector, on the application of John Evelyn, Esq. presented these curious remains of antiquity to the university of Oxford.

At that time Selden's work was become scarce *. It was therefore thought necessary, that another edition of the inscriptions should be published. Accordingly, bishop Fell † engaged Mr. Prideaux in this important work. Prideaux, though he had not then been six years at the university ‡, acquitted himself with great reputation. His edition was printed at Oxford in 1676, under the following title:

> Marmora Oxoniensia, ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis, aliisque conflata, recensuit, et perpetuo commentario explicavit, Humphridus Prideaux, Ædis Christi alumnus, appositis ad eorum nonnulla Seldeni & Lydiati annotationibus. Accessit Sertorii Ursati Patavini de Notis Romanorum Commentarius. Oxonii, è Theatro Sheldoniano. MDCLXXVI. folio.

In 1721, Dr. Prideaux being then advanced in years ‖, and unable to superintend the republication of his own work, Mr. Robert Pearse, of Edmund Hall, in Oxford,

for Constantinople, and returned in 1665. In 1667, he presented the marbles to the university of Oxford. In 1668, he was created LL.D. In 1669, he was advanced to the dignity of baron, by the title of lord Howard of Castle Rising. In 1672, he was created earl of Norwich, and earl marshal. Upon the death of his elder brother Thomas, in 1677, he became duke of Norfolk. His Grace died at his house in Arundel-street, Jan. 11, 1683-4. Collins's Peerage.

* Selden died, Nov. 30, 1654, aged 70.

† Optimus igitur Fellus noster Humphredo Prideaux, A. B. et Ædis Christi alumno, demandandum voluit. Chand. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. iii.

‡ Qui nondum tum sextum annum in his musarum scholis compleveram. Prid. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. x.

‖ Dean Prideaux died in 1724, aged 76.

proposed

proposed to reprint it, and obtained the author's permission to make what corrections in it he might think necessary. But Mr. Pearse never carried his scheme into execution.

In 1726, Dr. David Wilkins, who the same year * had published the works of Mr. Selden, promised to give a new edition of the Arundelian inscriptions. In the mean time, some other engagements engrossed his attention, and he likewise relinquished his design.

In 1732, Mr. Maittaire obliged the public with a more comprehensive view of the Marbles, than either of his predecessors, in a work, entitled,

Marmorum Arundellianorum, Seldenianorum, aliorúmque Academiæ Oxoniensi donatorum, cum variis commentariis et indice, secunda editio. Londini, typis Gulielmi Bowyer. MDCCXXXII. folio.

In this publication the editor has given, First, the Greek and Latin inscriptions in capitals, and four inscriptions in Hebrew; then the Greek text in small letters, with a Latin translation by Selden, Prideaux, and Price, p. 1. to 99.

Secondly, the dissertations and comments of learned men separately, and at full length: namely,

1. Selden commentary, from p. 99 to 197.
2. Price's notes on the third marble [Marmor Cretense] p. 197—200.
3. Palmerius's notes and supplements to the first marble [the Parian Chronicle] p. 200—222.
4. Lydiat's annotations on the same. p. 222—295.
5. Marsham's commentaries on the first 58 epochas of the same marble. p. 295—309.
6. Prideaux's commentary on the marbles. p. 309—509.

* This edition of Selden's works, in three volumes folio, was begun in 1722, and finished in 1726.

7. Some notes on the marbles by Reinesius. p. 509—524.

8. Spon's notes on some of the marbles. p. 524—527.

9. Chishull's notes on the third marble. p. 527—532.

10. Extracts from Smith's Epistle concerning the Seven Churches of Asia. p. 532—533.

11. Extracts from Bentley's Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris. p. 533—540.

12. Maffei's Italian version of the first and second marbles, with notes. p. 540—549. [The second marble contains the Smyrnean and Magnesian league.]

13. Dodwell's chronological tables of the first marble. p. 549—553.

14. Conjectures and remarks on the marbles and the preceding comments, by the editor. p. 553—605.

Lastly, A copious index, interspersed with many critical notes and observations.

Mr. Prideaux, in his edition, had ranged the inscriptions in the order, in which the marbles were placed, while they stood in the court-yard belonging to Sheldon's Theatre *. But as they were afterwards removed to a more convenient situation †, Maittaire reduced them, as nearly as he could, to the order observed by Gruter and others, who have arranged such ancient monuments, according to the nature and importance of their respective subjects.

In 1763, after the university had acquired a great variety of other ancient marbles, by the benefactions of Sir

* Delata sunt Oxonium, in plateâ Theatri Sheldoniani deposita, vel muro qui eam ambit infixa, & initiali literâ Howardiani nominis notata. Chand. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. iii.

† They are now carefully preserved in a room, adjoining to the public schools at Oxford, called the Museum Arundelianum.

George

George Wheler, the Countess of Pomfret in the year 1755, Mr. Dawkins, Dr. Rawlinson, and others, Dr. Chandler undertook to give the public a new and improved copy of these valuable remains of antiquity; and accordingly published a very magnificent volume, entitled, MARMORA OXONIENSIA.

This work is divided into three parts. The first consists of 59 copper-plates, representing 167 statues, busts, urns, vases, altars, &c. without inscriptions.

The second contains 100 Egyptian, Palmyrene, Greek, and other inscriptions, and eleven plates.

The third consists of 145 inscriptions in Latin, Arabic, and other languages, and six plates.

To the whole is subjoined a verbal index.

This learned and ingenious editor has corrected the mistakes of his predecessors; and in some of the inscriptions, particularly that of the Parian Chronicle, has supplied the lacunæ by many happy CONJECTURES.

CHAP. II.

IT seemed necessary to premise a general account of the marbles, that the reader may the more easily comprehend the following observations.

The DOUBTS, which have sometimes occurred to me, with respect to the authenticity of the Parian Chronicle, arise from the following considerations:

I. The characters have no certain or unequivocal marks of antiquity.

II. It is not probable, that the Chronicle was engraved for PRIVATE USE.

III. It does not appear to have been engraved by PUBLIC AUTHORITY.

IV. The Greek and Roman writers, for a long time after the date of this work, complain, that they had no chronological account of the affairs of ancient Greece.

V. This Chronicle is not once mentioned by any writer of antiquity.

VI. Some of the facts seem to have been taken from authors of a later date.

VII. Parachronisms appear in some of the epochas, which we can scarcely suppose a Greek chronologer, in the CXXIX Olympiad, would be liable to commit.

VIII. The history of the discovery of the marbles is obscure and unsatisfactory.

Lastly, The literary world has been frequently imposed upon, by spurious books and inscriptions; and therefore we should be extremely cautious, with regard

gard to what we receive under the venerable name of antiquity.

I. The characters in this inſcription have no certain or unequivocal marks of antiquity.

It is written, like other ancient inſcriptions, in capitals, without any diſtances between the words, and without any points or accents.

Selden informs us, that all the letters, except Π and Ζ, are EXACTLY repreſented by the common Greek types; that the *Pi* has the perpendicular line, on the right hand, only half as long as the parallel line on the left, thus, Γ; and the *Zeta*, the form of a proſtrate H, in this manner, ⌶ *.

It is generally ſuppoſed, that this was the more ancient way of writing the *Zeta* †; and that afterwards the

* Non licuit per operarum formas, omnes archetyporum figuras ubique repræſentare; quod tamen plerumque in univerſis, ſed in prioribus binis EXACTE, fecimus, EXCEPTIS TANTUMMODO Π et Ζ. Το Π tum in chronologico hôc Marmore, tum in Smyrnæorum Decretis et Fœdere, perpetuò, crus, quod ad dextram vergit, habet dimidiatum ad hunc modum Γ. In recentioribus inſcriptionibus quas dedimus, utrumque crus æquè ſemper extenditur; et Ζητα etiam non aliter quàm uſitatis typographorum formis exaratur. In vetuſtioribus autem hiſce binis Ζητα hâc ſemper figurâ ⌶ occurrit, quæ ητα ὕπτιον, ſive eta ſupinum, dicitur Alypio. Seld. Marm. Arund. p. 76.

† Vetus ejus figura ⌶ paulatim in Ζ deflexa eſt. Chiſhul. Antiq. Aſiatic. p. 20.

ΓΠ. Hâc utrâque formâ PASSIM ſcribitur, ut videre eſt in alphabeto Cyziceni marmoris. [Montf. Palæog. Græc. p. 144.] Prior forma Γ, decurtatâ poſtremâ lineâ, vetuſtior eſt; unde factum P Latinum, mutando quadrata rotundis. Ibid. p. 142.—Π Γ prima forma priſca eſt: ſecunda item in marmoribus vetuſtiſſimis PASSIM habetur. Ibid. p. 337.

Ζ. Sic inciſum habetur in nummis & marmoribus; ſed hâc formâ etiam NON INFREQUENTER obſerves ⌶, quo pacto ſcribitur in Cyziceno marmore. Ibid. p. 142.

I middle

middle bar was drawn diagonally from the extremity of the upper line on the right hand, to the end of the lower line on the left, as it now stands in our modern alphabets.

Yet these two characters, Γ and Ξ, so frequently occur, and are so well known, that any modern fabricator of a Greek inscription, which he intends to impose upon the world, as a relic of antiquity, would most probably use them, in preference to the more common and ordinary forms.

It is however observable, that the letters in the Parian Chronicle have no appearance of antiquity, except this very equivocal one.

They do not in the least resemble the Sigean *, the Nemean †, or the Delian ‡ inscriptions, which are supposed

* See a copy of the Sigean inscription in Chishull's Antiquitates Asiaticæ, p. 4.—This celebrated inscription is on part of an ancient pilaster, eight feet seven inches long, something more than eighteen inches wide, and a little above ten inches thick. It was intended to record the donations, which one Phanodicus of Proconnesus had made to a temple at Sigeum. The stone, at present, is used as a seat at the door of a Greek church, in a little village called Giaurkioi, in a place, where the city Sigeum formerly stood, three miles from the Sigean promontory. The inscription is written in the manner, which the Greeks called boustrophedon; that is, the lines turn on the marble, as *oxen turn* in plowing, *from the left* to the right, and from the right to the left, alternately. The retrograde order of the letters is a relic of the oriental way of writing. This inscription is supposed to have been engraved about 560 years before the vulgar æra. Chandler's Trav. in Asia Minor, ch. xii.

† The Nemean inscription may be seen in the Thesaurus Inscriptionum, collected by Muratori, and illustrated by M. Bimard, who supposes it to be next in antiquity to the Sigean.

‡ The Delian inscription was brought from the East by M. Tournefort, who copied it from the base of a statue, supposed to be that of Apollo, thrown down in the isle of Delos. It consists of about

posed to be of a more ancient date. They differ, in many respects, from the letters on the Marmor Sandvicense *, which, according to the learned editor of that inscription, was engraved in the year before Christ 374. They bear no sort of resemblance to the characters on the Farnesian pillars †, to those of the Alexandrian manuscript, or others of a later date. They seem to resemble, perhaps more than any other, the letters of the alphabet, taken by Montfaucon from the Marmor Cyzicenum, at Venice ‡. They are plain and simple in

about eight words, in uncouth letters, which, Montfaucon thinks, were the ancient Ionian characters. Tournef. Voyages, let. 7. Chish. Antiq. Asiat. p. 16. Montf. Palæog. Græc. l. ii. c. 1. p. 122.

* The Marmor Sandvicense was found at Athens, and brought to England by lord Sandwich, in 1739. The inscription contains an account of the public money, collected for the festival of Apollo at Delphi, for four years, by the Amphictyones. The letters are placed at equal distances; and each letter of every subsequent line stands exactly under each letter of the preceding line; consequently, all the lines contain the same number of letters. In this position, the letters, with the interstices, appear like small perpendicular columns, extending from the bottom to the top of the marble. Marmor Sandvicense, cum commentario & notis J. Taylori, LL.D. 4to. 1743.

† Two columns found on the Appian road, about three miles from Rome, and removed from thence to the Farnesian palace. They are supposed to have been erected by Herodes Atticus, at his villa Triopia. Herodes was a scholar, and an admirer of antiquities. He was consul at Rome in the year 143.

"Part of the inscription is on one pillar, and part on the other." It is intended to exhibit a specimen of the old Ionic letters; but seems to be a mere "simia vetustatis," and is perhaps a forgery. Montf. Palæog. Græc. p. 135. 140. Scal. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 110. Salmas. Duarum Inscript. Explic. p. 29. See Letters from a Young Painter, let. 22. 51.

‡ Montf. Palæog. Græc. l. ii. c. 4. p. 144.—Montfaucon thinks, that this inscription must have been engraved before the time of Alexander the Great.

their

their form, and such as an ordinary stone-cutter of the present age would probably make, if he were employed to engrave a Greek inscription, according to the alphabet now in use. The small letters, intermixed among the larger, have an air of affectation and artifice, rather than genuine antiquity *.

For my own part, I am persuaded, that the antiquity of an inscription can never be proved by the mere form of the letters; because the most ancient characters may be as easily counterfeited, as those, which now compose our present alphabets.

That the learned reader may form a competent idea of the characters in the Parian Chronicle, a small specimen, accurately copied from a plate in the Marmora Oxoniensia, published by Dr. Chandler, is annexed to this Dissertation.

It may be said, that there are several archaïsms in this Chronicle, which are evident marks of antiquity: as,

Εγ instead of εκ.

εγ Λυκωρειας, è Lycoriâ. l. 7.
εγ Μιτυληνης, è Mitylene. l. 51.

Εγ instead of εν.

εγ Κυβελοις, in Cybelis. l. 19.
εγ Κελαιναις, in Celænis. ibid.

Εμ instead of εν.

εμ Παρῳ, in Paro. l. 2.
εμ παρα . . αδι, in maritimâ regione. l. 17.
εμ Μαραθωνι, in Marathone. l. 62.

Αμ instead of αν.

ἃς αμ Μινως αξιωσει, quascunque Minos postularet. l. 34.

* But see Montf. Palæog. Græc. l. iii. c. 4. p. 142.

But

, ex editionis

III. p.104.

ΕΚΑΙΗΕΝΘΕΡΜΟ

η εν Θερμο-

rfodito,

2.

But from these and other similar expressions in the inscription, we can draw no conclusion in favour of its authenticity.

Some grammarians and commentators on the Marbles have indeed observed, that, in ancient inscriptions, γ is used instead of ν, at the end of a word, when the next begins with γ, κ, or χ: as, τηγ γραφην, τωγ κατοικων, μεγ καταλοχισμους, τογ χρονον; and instead of κ, when the following word begins with δ, λ, or μ: as εγ δε, εγ Λυκωρειας, εγ Μιτυληνης; and that μ likewise, at the end of words *, is used instead of ν, before β, μ, π, φ, ὁ: as, γηραιομ βιοτας, εμ Μαγνησια, εμ Πανδοις, τημ πολιν, τομ πολεμον, τημ φιλιαν, τημ ὁμολογιαν †, &c.

But what reason could there be for introducing these archaïsms, as they are called, into the Parian Chronicle? We do not usually find them in Greek writers of the same age, or even in those of the most early date. The reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus was not an age of rude antiquity, with respect to the Greek language. It was 600 years after the time of Homer and Hesiod, and 130 after that of Xenophon and Plato, when the

* As a labial before another labial, β, μ, π, φ, ψ, in composition, μ is COMMONLY used for ν: as, εμβαινω, συμμαχεω, συμπλεκω, συμφερω, συμψηφος; but not as a final.

Pleraque nos illâ quasi mugiente literâ claudimus M, quâ NULLUM Græcè verbum cadit. Quint. l. xii. c. 10.

Vocibus in Graiis nunquam ultima conspicior M.

Auson. Edyl. 12.

It may be observed, by the way, that this is not an irregular verse, as some have erroneously imagined, who have called the final letter *em*, instead of μυ.

In M, says J. Cæs. Scaliger, nullam vocem Græcia terminavit: barbaris nobisque modus nullus. De Caus. Ling. Lat. l. i. c. 10. Vid. Scalig. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 114.

† Maittaire, Marm. Arund. p. 615. 638. Id. Ling. Græc. Dialect. p. 163. 381.

Greek language was ſpoken and written in its utmoſt purity and elegance.

We can ſcarcely ſuppoſe, that even a ſtone-cutter, in that refined age, would have been permitted to diſgrace a ſuperb and learned monument with ſuch barbariſms.

However this may be, the preceding archaïſms are not uniformly obſerved in the Chronicle. We find the author writing, a little inconſiſtently,

τον Παρνασσον, Parnaſſum. l. 4.
την Καδμειαν, Cadmeam. l. 12.
τον καρπον, fructum. l. 27.
μεν Κριτιου, quidèm Critiæ. l. 52.
εν μαχῃ, in prælio. l. 63.
εν Πλαταιαις, ad Platæas. l. 67.

I am almoſt tempted to ſuſpect, that εμ Παρῳ, εμ Μαραθωνι, and other pretended archaïſms, are owing to a mere affectation of antiquity, or to a corrupted dialect and pronunciation in later ages. For, if we may depend on the authority of Dr. Bentley, "the modern Greeks, though they write the ν in theſe caſes, pronounce that letter as μ *."

Theſe archaïſms, I know, appear on other marbles; but, for that very reaſon, they would naturally be adopted by the fabricator of a ſuppoſititious inſcription. And the authenticity of thoſe inſcriptions, in which they appear, muſt be eſtabliſhed, before they can be produced, in oppoſition to the preſent argument.

* Diſſert. on Phal. § 14. p. 334.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

II. IT is ſcarcely probable, that ſuch an expenſive and cumberſome work, as the chronological marble, would have been executed by a private citizen, a philoſopher, or an hiſtorian, at Paros, either for his own amuſement, or for the benefit of his fellow-citizens.

This will appear by the following conſiderations. Firſt, a long inſcription, containing a general ſyſtem of chronology, could not be engraved on marble, without ſuch an expenſe, as few learned Greeks were able to afford. Or, if the author, by an uncommon felicity, was able to erect ſuch a literary monument, the ſcheme would have been uſeleſs and imprudent; as all the contents of the inſcription might have been publiſhed more commodiouſly and effectually, by the common mode of writing, in uſe at that time. For,

Secondly, a manuſcript is more readily circulated from hand to hand, and copies of it more eaſily multiplied and diſperſed. This inſcription, it is true, might have been copied; but no writer of antiquity ſeems to have either ſeen or heard of ſuch a copy.

Thirdly, a manuſcript is eaſily corrected and improved, as the author, from time to time, may ſee occaſion. But an inſcription on marble is unalterable. On this account, a league, a ſtatute, a decree, an epitaph, &c. which do not uſually require any alteration, may be very properly inſcribed on marble. Whereas a ſyſtem of chronology, attended with innumerable difficulties, and frequently founded on mere conjectures, muſt ne-

ceſſarily demand repeated corrections. A writer therefore, of common prudence and diſcretion, would not ſubject himſelf to the impoſſibility of making occaſional emendations in his own performance.

Fourthly, in a work of conſiderable extent, like the Parian Chronicle, containing a multiplicity of names, facts, and dates, a ſtone-cutter will inevitably make a number of miſtakes *, which can never be rectified on the marble. For inſtance, there is an error in the twenty-fifth epocha, either of the author, or of the ſtone-cutter, which it was not eaſy, or perhaps not poſſible, to correct, after the ſubſequent letters were engraved †.

Fifthly, the letters of an inſcription on ſtone are liable to be defaced by a variety of accidents; and the ſmalleſt mutilation, in a numeral character, will totally deſtroy a chronological computation.

Laſtly, ancient writers ſeem to have agreed, that a manuſcript is more likely to be tranſmitted to poſterity, than an inſcription, either on marble or braſs.

Ovid was certainly of this opinion, when he thus congratulated himſelf on the immortality of his writings, and bade defiance to the ravages of war and conflagrations, to the fury of winds and ſtorms, and the devaſtations of time:

> Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira, nec ignes,
> Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetuſtas ‡.

Horace, on the publication of his odes, exclaims,

* Plurima paſſim occurrunt errata quadratariorum. Id enim genus opifices, extra mechanicam artem lapidariam, non forſan admodum periti, uti nunc ſæpe, ita et olim, errare ſoliti ſunt. Marm. Arund. edit. Maitt. p. 573.

† See epoc. 25, where the omiſſion of εικοσου και occaſions a groſs impropriety.

‡ Ovid. Met. l. xv. 871.

Exegi

Exegi monumentum ære perennius *,

"I have raiſed a monument more laſting than braſs;" and conſequently more durable than marble.

Thucydides, likewiſe, when he wrote the hiſtory of the Peloponneſian war, entitled it, κτημα ες αει, "an everlaſting poſſeſſion †."

But the author of the Parian Chronicle, ſuppoſing it to be genuine, muſt be ſuppoſed to have deviated from the common mode of writing, without any ſort of propriety, or any reaſonable motive; he muſt be ſuppoſed to have put himſelf to a conſiderable, and, at the ſame time, a uſeleſs expenſe; and to have committed his elaborate performance to a ſtone, which he could neither alter, nor conveniently remove, nor ſecure from violence, or the depredation of thoſe, who might value the marble more than the inſcription.

For theſe reaſons it does not ſeem probable, that the Parian Chronicle was the production of a private citizen, either for his own uſe, or for the benefit of the public.

It may be ſaid, that the practice of writing upon pillars, ſtones, or marble, whatever was thought worthy of being tranſmitted to poſterity, was very common among the nations of antiquity; that we read of the pillars of Seth ‡, of Hermes or Mercury ||, and Acicarus the Babylonian §; and that Sanchoniatho,

* Hor. l. iii. od. 30.

† Thucyd. l. i. § 22.

‡ The Jews had an old tradition, that the deſcendents of Seth erected two pillars, on which they inſcribed their inventions; and one of them, if we may believe Joſephus, remained in his time, κατα γην την Σιριαδα, in terrâ Siriade, in the land of Siriad, or Sirias. Joſ. Antiq. Jud. l. i. c. 2. § 3.

|| Jamblic. de Myſt. Ægyp. ſect. i. c. 2.

§ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 15. p. 356. edit. Oxon. 1715.—

Who

choniatho *, Pythagoras, Plato †, Manetho ‡, and other ancient authors, collected many things in their writings from ſuch ancient monuments.

In anſwer to this objection, we may remark, that nothing can be more fabulous and uncertain, than the accounts, which are tranſmitted to us, concerning the pillars, ſaid to have been erected in the early ages. The pillars of Seth, for example, may be reckoned among the fictions or the miſtakes ‖ of Joſephus. The place

Who Acicarus was, is uncertain. A late writer ſuppoſes him to have been Achiacharus, mentioned in the book of Tobit, c. i. 22. Diſſert. in Daniel. ſecund. LXX. p. 381. Diogenes Laertius aſcribes a book, entitled, Acicharus, to Theophraſtus; but we know nothing of its contents. l. v. § 50.

* Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9. p. 32.

† Jamb. loc. cit.

‡ Εν τη Σηριαδικη γη. Manetho pretended, that he extracted his Egyptian dynaſties from the pillars of Hermes. Euſeb. Chron. Græc. p. 6. Maneth. apud Syncell. p. 40. Goari Annot. in loc.

‖ Herodotus tells us, that he himſelf had ſeen ſome of the pillars of Seſoſtris, εν τη Παλαιστινη Συριη, in the Syrian Paleſtine, l. ii. § 106.

The pillar, which, Joſephus ſays, was remaining in his time, was probably one of theſe; and having the name of Seſoſtris, or Sethos, inſcribed upon it, he imagined it had been erected by the deſcendents of Seth. Or perhaps the pillar, which he aſcribed to thoſe antediluvian philoſophers, was one of the pillars of Mercury or Thoth, mentioned by Manetho. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Pſeud. tom. i. p. 150. Dodwell on Sanchon. § 13.

That an antediluvian pillar ſhould be ſtanding in the time of Joſephus, is incredible. But it is not the only legendary tale, which we find in the writings of that author. The eloquent ſon of Matthias, though in other reſpects a valuable hiſtorian, relates many ridiculous fictions: ſuch as that of the pillar of ſalt being then exiſting. Antiq. l. i. c. 11. § 4. of Eleazar and the demon. Ibid. l. viii. c. 2. § 5. of the Sabbatic river. De Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 5. § 1. of the plant called Baaras. Ibid. c. 6. § 3, &c.

 Speaking

place where, he pretends, they exifted, κατα την Συριαδα, or Σιριαδα, was an unknown region, which has never been difcovered.

It was no unufual thing to impofe upon the world on the credit of fuch pillars. "Euhemerus," fays the learned Mr. Dodwell, "was looked upon by antiquity, as a famous inftance of it *. It was certainly the eafieft way for broaching falfhoods. Thefe were monuments, which could be produced on a fudden, concerning the moft remote antiquities, without the atteftation of ancient writings; becaufe they were fuppofed to be origi-

Speaking of the pillar of falt, he fays, ἱϛορηκα δ' αυτην, ετι γαρ και νυν διαμενει. Eam fiquidem VIDI, nam et hodie ufque manet. edit. Haverc. 1726. In this paffage, and in the ftory of the demon, he ufes the word ἱϛορηκα, or ἱϛορησα, which is ufually tranflated VIDI, "I have feen." But for the fake of his credit, I would rather fuppofe it ought to be tranflated, *memoravi*, de illâ *relationem accepi*, or *nunciatum eft mihi de illâ.*

The author of a poem, entitled, SODOMA, annexed to the works of Tertullian, is not content with faying, the pillar of falt exifted in his time, but he makes a WONDERFUL IMPROVEMENT in the ftory.

Durat adhuc etenim nudâ ftatione fub æthram,
Nec pluviis dilapfa fitu, nec diruta ventis.
Quinetiam, fi quis mutilaverit advena formam,
Protinus ex fefe fuggeftu vulnera complet.
Dicitur et vivens, alio jam corpore, fexûs
Munificos folito difpungere fanguine menfes.

Tertull. Op. p. 644.

* Euhemerus the Meffenian compofed a hiftory of Jupiter and other gods, from materials, which he pretended to have collected in the courfe of his travels; particularly from an infcription on a golden pillar in the temple of Jupiter Triphylius, in an ifland called Panchæa, fomewhere in the Arabian ocean. Eufeb. Præp. Evang. l. ii. c. 2. p. 60. Lactan. l. i. c. 11. See Diodorus Siculus, l. v. p. 318, 319, where this ifland is defcribed. Strabo and Plutarch reprefent Panchæa as a fabulous region, which nobody had ever feen. Strab. l. vii. p. 459. edit. 1707. Plut. de Ifid. et Ofir. p. 360.

nals

nals of the times they pretended to give an account of; were supposed to be remote from vulgar knowledge or understanding, being either kept in the adyta, or locked up in some obsolete, unknown character, which none but the learned and the priests could understand; were contrived in hieroglyphics, or such ambiguous notes, as were capable of what interpretation those designing persons, who produced them, were pleased to put upon them; were generally founded on oral tradition, than which there is not a more unfaithful conveyer of monuments to posterity; and wholly depended on the credit of the priests, who, at the same time, were generally interested in the things thus preserved, by their contributing to the support of their false religion, or to the honour of their nation for antiquity or rare inventions; and, lastly, were to be found and examined only in one place, not, like books, every where; nor even there, without the leave and direction of such interested priests. Upon this account, the stories, with which it was fashionable in those times to adorn their dialogues, were grounded on the credit of such pretended inscriptions: as, the table of Cebes; the Samothracian [Hyperborean] inscriptions, referred to by Axiochus *; and those concerning the Atlantides in Timæus †."

Almost all the fabricators of supposititious writings have pretended to derive their information from such obscure and suspicious sources. Thus, the publisher of the fragments, ascribed to Sanchoniatho, would make us believe, that he compiled his Phœnician history from the books of Taaut ‡, the Αποκρυφα Αμμουνεων γραμματα,

* Plato [sive Æschines] in Axiocho, p. 371. edit. Serrani, 1578.

† Plato in Timæo.—See Dodwell on Sanch. § 11.

‡ Taaut, "called by the Ægyptians Thoyth; by the Alexandrians Thoth; by the Greeks Hermes." Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9.

the

the mystical records of the Ammoneans, concealed in the sacred recesses of their temples *. Thus, Philostratus asserts, that he took his account of Apollonius Tyaneus from the memoirs of Damis the Assyrian †. Thus, Gelasius Cyzicenus tells us, that he found in his father's house an ancient volume, containing a history of the council of Nice ‡. And thus, Geoffrey of Monmouth would persuade us, that he translated his British history from an old manuscript, found in Armorica by Walter Calenius, archdeacon of Oxford, in the reign of Henry the First ‖.

But allowing the ancient inscriptions abovementioned all the credit that can be desired; admitting it likewise as a fact, that mankind, in rude or early ages, wrote on stones §, bricks, tiles ¶, marble, lead,

* Euseb. Præp. Evang. loc. cit.—The letters or writings of the Ammoneans, according to Bochart, were inscriptions or records, used in חמנים *bammanim*, in temples or shrines; for חמה, *bamma*, signifies the sun, and חמן, *bamman*, the temple of the sun. Phaleg. par. ii. l. ii. c. 17.——Sir John Marsham thinks, the Ammonei were the Thebans, or inhabitants of No-Ammon. Canon Chron. sec. x. p. 244.

† Philost. in v. Apollon. l. i. c. 3. Suidas.

‡ Cave, Hist. Liter. sub an. 476. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. v. c. 24. vol. viii. p. 571.

‖ Galfredi Monumet. l. xii. c. 20. Leland de Script. Brit. c. 157. p. 187. Baleus, p. 180. Pitseus sub an. 1120, 1152.

§ Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 6. Lucan. l. iii. 222.——Gothos majorum acta patrii sermonis carminibus vulgata, linguæ suæ literis, saxis ac rupibus insculpenda curasse. Saxo-Gram. Hist. Dan. præf.

¶ Epigenes apud Babylonios DCCXXX annorum observationes siderum, coctilibus laterculis inscriptas, docet. Plin. l. vii. p. 56.

In this passage Pliny certainly wrote $\overline{\text{DCCXXX}}$, or 720,000 years; for how could he produce the observations of 720 years as a

proof,

lead *, copper, wood †, bark, &c. this could be no reason, why the author of the Parian Chronicle ſhould engrave his performance on any of thoſe materials.

The moſt ancient nations made uſe of them, becauſe they were not acquainted with any thing more proper or convenient; and as there were but few in thoſe rude ages, who practiſed the art of writing, it was ne-

proof, that the uſe of letters among the Babylonians was *æternus*, eternal, or of the higheſt antiquity? Cicero mentions the obſervations of the Babylonians, for the ſpace of 470,000 years; Diodorus for 473,000, and Africanus for 480,000. In a ſubſequent ſentence Pliny ſays, "the loweſt computation of them by Beroſus and Critodemus was 480 years;" which ſhould undoubtedly be 480,000. If theſe years are only *days*, as ſome writers maintain, 720,000 will make about 1972 Julian years. Vid. Cic. de Divinat. l. i. § 36. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 118. Afric. apud Syncell. p. 17.

The Babylonians wrote on tiles, becauſe probably there were no ſtones at Babylon. The prophet Ezekiel, when he was a captive in that country, was ordered to make a repreſentation of Jeruſalem upon a tile, which was to be a ſymbolical or prophetical ſign of its deſtruction by the king of Babylon. ch. iv. 1. Jackſon, Chron. Antiq. vol. i. p. 218.

* Pauſanias relates, that the Bœotians, who lived near the fountain Hippocrene, ſhewed him a copy of Heſiod's poem, entitled ΕΡΓΑ, inſcribed on lead. Pauſan. l. ix. c. 31.

Hanc [papyrum] Alexandri Magni victoriâ repertam, auctor eſt M. Varro, conditâ in Ægypto Alexandriâ; antea non fuiſſe chartarum uſum; palmarum foliis primò ſcriptitatum; deinde quarundam arborum libris; poſtea PUBLICA MONUMENTA plumbeis voluminibus; mox et privata linteis confici cœpta aut cereis. Pugillarium enim uſum fuiſſe etiam ante Trojana tempora invenimus apud Homerum, Il. vi. 169. Varronis Fragm. p. 230. Plin. l. xiii. c. 11. Front. Stratag. l. iii. c. 13. § 7. Job xix. 24.

† ——————Leges incidere ligno.

Hor. Art. Poet. v. 399.

Solonis leges Athenis axibus ligneis inciſæ ſunt. A. Gell. l. ii. c. 12.

cessary

ceſſary to uſe the moſt ſolid and durable ſubſtances, for the preſervation of their public acts and monuments. But long before the date of the Parian Chronicle, more commodious materials were invented.

In the oldeſt writings now extant, the Jewiſh ſcriptures, we frequently read of books and volumes. Moſes mentions the book of the Covenant, the book of the Law, and the book of the Wars of the Lord *. The author of the hiſtory of Joſhua refers to the book of Jaſher †. Job wiſhes, that his adverſary had written a book ‡. David appeals to the VOLUME of the book ‖. Solomon ſays, of making many books there is no end §. And, laſtly, ſeveral of the prophets ſpeak of ROLLS, and ROLLS of books ¶.

We have likewiſe an account of books and volumes, in the early ages of pagan antiquity.

Herodotus tells us, that *diphtheræ*, or the ſkins of ſheep and goats, were uſed for writing by the ancient Ionians **. Diodorus Siculus likewiſe informs us, that the ancient Perſians wrote their records on ſkins ††.

* Exod. xxiv. 7. Deut. xxxi. 26. Numb. xxi. 14.—Moſes died bef. Chr. 1451 years. Uſher.

† Joſhua, x. 13.

‡ Job, xxxi. 35.

‖ Pſal. xl. 7. במגלת ספר, in volumine libri. גלל fig. *volvit, convolvit*, &c.

§ Eccleſ. xii. 12.

¶ Iſa. viii. 1. Jer. xxxvi. 2. Ezek. ii. 9.

** Και τας βιβλους διφθερας καλεουσι απο του παλαιου δι Ιωνες, ὁτι κοτε, εν σπανι βιβλων, εχρεωντο, διφθερῃσι αιγεῃσι τε και οιεῃσι. Priſcâque conſuetudine libros Iones appellant *diphtheras*, quòd aliquandò, penuriâ biblorum, pellibus caprinis ovilliſque utebantur. Herod. l. v, § 58.

†† Εν διφθεραις δι Περσαι τας παλαιας πραξεις, κατα τινα νομον, ειχον συντεταγμενας. In membranis res antiquas Perſæ, quâdam lege, ordine deſcriptas habebant. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 118. Αρχαιοτερα διφθερας, diphtherâ antiquiora. Suidas.

Varro relates, that the use of the Egyptian papyrus for writing on, was introduced, when Alexander the Great built Alexandria in Egypt *; that is, about the year bef. Chr. 332. Guilandinus endeavours to prove from Alcæus, Anacreon, Æschylus, the ancient comic poets, Plato, Aristotle, and others, that the papyrus was used for that purpose long before the time of Alexander †. Many of his testimonies indeed, as the learned Scaliger has shewn ‡, are fallacious; yet it is evident from the words of Herodotus, cited in the margin, that the biblos or papyrus was used for writing in his time. It is not however necessary to prove, by the testimony of ancient authors, that books were written on parchment, on paper made of the Egyptian papyrus, or any such materials, before the date of the Parian Chronicle. This is sufficiently evinced by the very existence of the writings of Moses, David, Solomon, and the Jewish prophets; the works of Homer, Hesiod, Anacreon, Pindar, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, &c. and is still more incontestably proved by the libraries, which were collected in preceding ages, or about that time; such as those of Polycrates in Samos, Pisistratus ‖ and Euclides at Athens, Nicocrates in Cyprus, Euripides the poet, Aristotle the philosopher §, Clearchus at Heraclea Pontica ¶, and the most extensive and magnificent library of Ptolemy Phi-

* Plin. loc. cit.

† Guilandinus de Papyro, p. 16. et seq.

‡ Scalig. Animadv. in Guiland. p. 9.

‖ A. Gell. l. vi. c. 17. Tertull. Apol. c. 18. Montf. Palæog. Græc. pref. p. xvi.

§ Athen. l. i. c. 2. See below, chap. xi.

¶ Memnon de Reb. Heracliæ Ponticæ, apud Photium, cod. 224. c. 8.

ladelphus

ladelphus * in Egypt, founded in or before the year 284, which in his time is said to have contained 100,000 volumes †; and to have been enlarged by his successors, to the amount of almost 700,000 ‡.

Not long afterwards a library was founded at Pergamus by Attalus and Eumenes, which, according to Plutarch, contained 200,000 volumes ||.

These

* Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, surnamed Soter, the father of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was a learned prince, as appears by his history of Alexander, which is honourably mentioned by the ancients. Vid. Arriani Præf. Plut. in v. Alex. Q. Curt. l. ix. c. 5. Suidas seems to intimate, that this prince collected a library; for he observes, "that Zenodotus the Ephesian lived in the time of the first Ptolemy, and was keeper των εν Αλεξανδρεια βιβλιοθηκων, of the libraries in Alexandria." Suid. in v. Ζηνοδοτος.

† Euseb. Chron. p. 66. Syncell. p. 271. Cedren. l. xxiii. Some writers tell us, that Philadelphus collected 200,000 volumes. Jos. Antiq. l. xii. c. 2. § 1. Alex. ab Alex. l. ii. c. 30.

‡ A. Gell. l. vi. c. 17. Am. Marcell. l. xxii. c. 16.—Four hundred thousand volumes are said to have been unfortunately burnt, when Julius Cæsar was attacked in Alexandria by Achillas, the commander of the Egyptian army. Oros. l. vi. c. 15. Seneca says, 40,000, or, according to some editions, 400,000. Sen. de Tranq. c. 9. A. Gellius asserts, that the whole library, consisting of near 700,000 volumes, was destroyed: "ea omnia incensa sunt." It is remarkable, that this unfortunate event is not mentioned, either by Julius Cæsar or Hirtius, in the history of the Alexandrian war.

|| Plut. in v. Anton. p. 943. Strab. l. xiii. p. 926. Plin. l. xiii. c. 10. l. xxxv. c. 2. Reges Attalici magnis philologiæ dulcedinibus inducti, cum egregiam bibliothecam Pergami ad communem delectationem instituissent; tunc item Ptolemæus infinito zelo, cupiditatisque incitatus studio, non minoribus industriis, ad eundem modum contenderat Alexandriæ comparare. Vitruv. præf. l. vii. Vitruvius does not mean, that there was a library at Pergamus, before there was one at Alexandria. Some writers, who have charged him with a mistake in this passage, have not attended

to

These are clear and decisive proofs, that the common mode of writing, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was NOT on STONES.

to the proper force of the word *contenderat*, in the præterpluperfect tense. Galen. in Hippoc. de Nat. Hom. Com. ii. p. 17.

The Ptolemean kings were, Ptolemy Soter or Lagi [filius], bef. Chr. 305. Ptol. Philadelphus, 285. Ptolemy Soter admitted his son Philadelphus into a share of the kingdom in 285, and died in 284. Ptol. Euergetes, 247. Ptol. Philopator, 222. Ptol. Epiphanes, 205. Ptol. Philometor, 181. Ptol. Euergetes the second, surnamed Physcon, 146. Ptol. Soter or Lathyrus, 117. Ptol. Alexander, 81. Ptol. Auletes, 65. Cleopatra, 51.

The kings of Pergamus were, Philetærus, 283. Eumenes, 263. Attalus, 241. Eumenes the second, 197. Attalus the second, 159. Attalus the third, 138. This prince died after a reign of five years, and made the Roman people his heirs. Eumenes the second founded, or at least improved, the celebrated library at Pergamus. Strab. l. xiii. p. 926. The Egyptian princes having prohibited the exportation of the papyrus, Eumenes ordered, that books should be made of parchment, which, from Pergamus, was called *pergamena*. Plin. l. xiii. c. 11. Isid. Orig. l. vi. c. 3. Hieron. Epist. ad Cromatium.

It is however very certain, that the kings of Pergamus were not the real inventors of parchment: they only found out a better way of making it, and brought it into more general use. Trotzius, de primâ scribendi Orig. p. 91. Funccius de Script. vet. p. 90.

CHAP. IV.

III. THIS Chronicle does not appear to have been engraved by PUBLIC AUTHORITY, by the direction of the magistrates, or the people of Paros.

First, because inscriptions of that kind usually begin in this manner:

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ, "the senate and the people;" or, in this form:

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ, "it pleased the senate and the people."

EXAMPLES.

Inscriptions in Spon's Miscellanea Eruditæ Antiquitatis, and other collections.

Athenis, in ædibus Jani Mistrigo. Sect. x. Inscript. 6. p. 319.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ Η ΕΞ ΑΡΕΙΟΥ ΠΑΓΟΥ
ΚΑΙ Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΤΩΝ Χ *
ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ ΒΕΡΕΝΕΙΚΗΝ,
κ. τ. λ.

Senatus Areopagi, & senatus sexcentorum, & populus, Juliam Berenicem, &c. hâc statuâ honorant.

* Character ille, vel sigla X̄, non mille, sed *sexcentos* solùm, significat: hoc est, eandem prorsus vim ac valorem obtinet, perinde ac si minusculo charactere χ pingeretur. Etenim Berenices & Agrippæ regis ætàte, Atheniensis senatus ex sexcentis solùm civibus constabat. Corsini Notæ Græcorum, p. 72. Id. Fasti Attici, tom. i. Differt. vi. p. 262.

Megaris.

Megaris. Inſcript. 11. p. 321.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ
ΤΙΒ. ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΝ ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ.

Senatus & populus *Megarenſis*, Tiberium Claudium Atticum, &c.

Megaris. Inſcript. 14. p. 327.

Ο ΔΑΜΟΣ
ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΝ
ΑΡΕΤΑΣ ΕΝΕΚΕΝ
ΚΑΙ ΕΥΕΡΓΕΣΙΑΣ.

Populus imperatorem Cæſarem, Divi filium, virtutis & beneficiorum cauſâ, honorat.

Δαμος et αρετας, Doricâ dialecto, quæ η in α mutat, pro δημος et αρετης.

Ibidem, ad ædem Panagias. Inſcript. 16. p. 327.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟC
Μ. ΑΙΜΙΛΙΟΝ CΑΤΟΡΝΕΙΝΟΝ.

Senatus et populus *Megarenſium* M. Æmilium Saturninum, &c. *venerantur.*

Conſtantinopoli, allata ex Paro inſulâ. Inſcript. 39. p. 334.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟC
ΤΟΝ ΤΗC ΑΡΙCΤΗC ΜΝΗΜΗC ΠΑΙΔΑ.

Senatus & populus *Pariorum* optimæ memoriæ filium, &c. honorârunt ſtatuâ æneâ.

Venetiis,

Venetiis, ad Cyzicum & insulam Paron pertinens inscriptio, ex Archipelago advecta *. Inscript. 45. p. 336.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ
ΓΟΡΓΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ
ΕΠΕΙ Η ΠΟΛΙΣ Η ΠΑΡΙΩΝ.

Placuit senatui & populo. Gorgonicus Dioc. f. dixit: quandoquidem urbs Pariorum, &c.

In Co insulâ. Inscript. 51. p. 337.

Α ΒΟΥΛΑ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΑΜΟΣ
ΤΗΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΗΣ
ΚΩΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΤΕΙΜΑΣΕΝ.

Senatus populúsque illustrissimæ Coorum civitatis honoravit Publium Sallustium, &c.

A *βουλα και ο δαμος*, Doricâ dialecto, pro *η βουλη και ο δημος*.

Smyrnæorum Decretum †.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ ΓΝΩΜΗ.

Placuit populo ducum sententia, &c.

Senatûs populíque Delii psephisma [decretum] quo Clinodemo, Leboti f. Siphnio, honores decernuntur ‡.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ
ΤΙΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΕΛΕΣΙΠΠΟΥ ΕΙΠΕ.

Placuit senatui & populo. Timocles Telesippi f. relationem fecit, &c.

* Vid. Montf. Diar. Ital. c. 3.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. Inscript. 26. p. 41.

‡ Reinesii Inscript. Antiq. p. 499. Seld. in Mar. Arund. num. xii. Maitt. p. 566.

This is the usual introductory form of inscriptions, composed by public authority. But the Parian chronologer begins HIS inscription in a very different manner, as follows:

ΑΝΕΓΡΑΨΑ τους ανωθεν χρονους, ΑΡΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ απο Κεκροπος, "I have described preceding times, beginning from Cecrops."

These are the words of a private man, speaking of his own performance in the first person singular, and do not in the least correspond with those forms of expression, which we generally find in inscriptions, composed by the order of the senate or the people of any country.

This argument cannot be much affected by observing, that the beginning of the inscription is obliterated; for it entirely depends on the words now remaining.

Secondly, the facts and dates, which are mentioned in this Chronicle, do not appear to have been extracted from any public records, or calculated to answer the purpose of authentic documents. For, in either view, it is most probable, the compiler would have preserved a regular series of kings and archons. But this is not the case. Many eminent princes and magistrates are passed over without notice. The facts, chiefly specified, are not matters of general or national importance; and, in several instances, the transactions of whole centuries are entirely omitted.

Thirdly, the Parian inscription is such a one, as we can hardly suppose the magistrates, or the people of Paros, would have ordered to be engraved.

Stately sepulchres, pillars, triumphal arches, and the like, were erected to perpetuate the glory of eminent men; and inscriptions upon them usually displayed their

various

various achievements *. Thus, we read of the pillars of Osiris, Bacchus, Sesostris †, Hercules ‡, and others.

The remembrance of events, in which nations were interested, the succession of princes, and perhaps the genealogies of eminent men ‖, were preserved in the same manner.

Leagues §, decrees, laws, &c. were likewise engraved on marble or brass, and fixed to a pillar, the walls of a temple, or other public buildings.

The Decalogue was written upon tables of hewn stone; and Joshua is said to have written a copy of the law upon the same materials ¶. In the time of Demosthenes there still existed a law of Theseus, written upon

* ——Incisa notis marmora PUBLICIS.
Hor. l. iv. od. 8.

† Herod. l. ii. § 106. Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 53. Strab. l. xvi. p. 1114. l. xvii. 1138.

‡ Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 226.

‖ Ακουσιλαος εγραψε γενεαλογιας εκ δελτων χαλκων, ἁς λογος ἑυρειν τον πατερα αυτου, ορυξαντα τινα τοπον της οικιας αυτου. "Acusilaus wrote genealogies from tables of brass, which, it was reported, his father found, as he was digging in some part of his house." Suidas.

Nothing can be more apocryphal and suspicious, than the origin of these genealogical tables. It has been always usual with the fabricators of supposititious inscriptions to pretend they found them, as Acusilaus did, under ground, in some cavern, or secret recess.

§ Thucydides speaks of Grecian pillars, on which treaties of peace and alliance were inscribed, at Olympia, at Pytho or Delphi, at the Isthmus, at Athens, at Lacedæmon, and other places, lib. v. c. 18. Dionysius Halicarnasseus mentions several treaties, which were engraved on pillars: as, that of Romulus with the Veientes, l. ii. c. 6. p. 118. that of Tullus Hostilius with the Sabines, l. iii. c. 8. p. 174. and that of Tarquinius Superbus with the Latins, l. iv. c. 6. p. 249.—Liv. l. ii. c. 33.

¶ Exod. xxxiv. 1. Josh. viii. 32. Deut. xxvii. 8.

a pillar of ſtone *. Certain decrees, in the reign of Servius Tullus, were inſcribed on a brazen column †. And the laws of the Twelve Tables were engraved on braſs ‡.

Virgil alludes to this cuſtom in the following verſe:

——Fixit leges pretio, atque refixit ‖.

And Ovid, in deſcribing the golden age,

———Nec verba minacia fixo
Ære legebantur §.

Suetonius informs us, that Veſpaſian, when he rebuilt the capitol, after it had been burnt by the ſoldiers of Vitellius, undertook to reſtore 3000 brazen plates, which were deſtroyed by the flames; and that by ſearching for copies of them in all places, he furniſhed the government with a freſh collection of curious and ancient records, containing the decrees of the ſenate, and the acts of the people, relative to treaties, alliances, and privileges, from times almoſt as early as the foundation of the city ¶.

Theſe inſcriptions, and others of the ſame kind, may be conſidered as public monuments, or public records; and were inſcribed on marble or braſs, with peculiar propriety, as they were profeſſedly deſigned for the inſpection

* Εν στηλη λιθινη. Demoſth. contra Neæram [ει γνησιως, Harpoc.] p. 873. edit. 1604.

† Dion. Halic. l. iv. c. 3. p. 230.

‡ Leges decemvirales, quibus tabulis duodecim eſt nomen, in æs inciſas, in publico propoſuerunt. Liv. l. iii. 57. Dion. Halic. l. x. c. 13. p. 681. Flor. l. i. c. 24.—A. Gellius informs us, that the laws of the XII Tables were written 300 years after the building of Rome. A. Gell. l. xx. c. 1.

‖ Virg. Æn. vi. 622.

§ Ovid. Met. l. i. 91.

¶ Suet. in v. Veſp. § 8. Tacit. Hiſt. l. iii. c. 7.

tion of the people; and eſſentially concerned their conduct, their property, their liberty, or their lives. But for whom could the Chronicle of Paros be intended?—It contains no encomiums on any of the patriots, the heroes, or the demi-gods, of the country; no decrees of the magiſtrates, no public records, no laws of ſtate. On the contrary, it is a work of mere ſpeculation and learning, in which the inhabitants of that iſland, eſpecially the common people, had not the leaſt intereſt or concern.

Theſe words at the beginning, αρχοντος εν Παρῳ, would naturally lead us to ſuppoſe, that the inſcription related to Paros; and there were certainly many circumſtances in the hiſtory of that iſland, worthy of notice.—I ſhall mention ſome of them.

Thucydides informs us, that the Cyclades were firſt inhabited by the Phœnicians and the Carians *; that Minos fitted out a fleet, took poſſeſſion of thoſe iſlands, planted colonies in moſt of them, and, having expelled the Carians, gave the government to his ſons †.

Apollodorus relates, that Hercules, when he was going to fetch the belt of Hippolyta, ſtopped at Paros; and that Eurymedon, Chryſes, Nephalion, and Philolaus, the ſons of Minos, then reſided in that iſland ‡. The ſame author obſerves, that the mother of theſe four princes was a native of Paros ‖; and that Minos himſelf was there, and offering a ſacrifice to the Graces, when he received the melancholy news of the death of his ſon Androgeus §.

* Stephanus Byzantinus ſays, "Paros was firſt inhabited by Cretans, and a few Arcadians." Steph. in v. Παρος.

† Thucyd. l. i. § 4. 8.

‡ Apollod. l. ii. c. 5. § 9. Apollodorus calls this famous belt Αρεος ζωστηρ, "the belt of Mars."

‖ Id. l. iii. c. 1. § 2.

§ Id. l. iii. c. 14. § 7.

Diodorus

Diodorus asserts, that after the destruction of Troy, the Carians, being grown more powerful, assumed the dominion of the sea, and having taken possession of the Cyclades, claimed some of them as their exclusive property, expelling the Cretans; and inhabited others, in conjunction with the people, who were already settled in those islands *.

Herodotus gives us the following anecdote of the Parians. The government of Miletus having been subverted by internal dissensions, the citizens requested the Parians to be arbitrators of their disputes. The Parians accepted the office; and, having surveyed the country of Miletus, appointed those to the magistracy, whose lands were best cultivated; reasonably concluding, that they who took proper care of their own estates, would not neglect the affairs of the commonwealth †. This prudent advice restored the city to its former tranquility.

C. Nepos asserts, that Miltiades subjected the Cyclades to the government of the Athenians ‡. Yet afterwards the Parians assisted Darius in his expedition against Greece. Miltiades, in order to punish them for this offence, or rather to revenge an affront offered to himself, the year after the victory at Marathon ‖, invaded the island, and laid siege to the capital. But the inhabitants defended themselves with so much bravery, that, after he had invested the city for twenty-six days, without success, he raised the siege, and returned to Athens in disgrace §.

* Diod. Sic. l. v. sub fin.

† Herod. l. v. § 28, 29.

‡ C. Nepos, in v. Milt. § 2.

‖ The battle of Marathon was fought in the year of the J. P. 4224. bef. Chr. 490. Petav. Rat. Temp. vol. ii. p. 126. Dodw. Annal. Thucyd. p. 44. Corsini Fast. Attic. tom. iii. p. 148.

§ Herod. l. vi. § 133. C. Nep. in v. Milt. § 7.

After the victory at Salamis, Themistocles exacted large contributions of the Parians, and other islanders in the Ægean sea, under pretence of punishing them for the favour they had shewn the Persians *.

In the year 431, at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, we find all the Cyclades, except Melos and Thera, in alliance with the Athenians †.

In the year 405, Lysander the Spartan general totally defeated Conon the Athenian at Ægos-potamos. Not long afterwards he reduced all the cities, which had been subject to the Athenians, under the Spartan government; and, in 404, taking the city of Athens, put an end to the Peloponnesian war ‡.

In 394, Conon the Athenian, having the command of the Persian fleet, gained a complete victory over the Lacedæmonians, near Cnidus; and among other states dependent on Lacedæmon, obliged the Cyclades to return to their former alliance ‖.

In 385, the Parians, by the advice of an oracle, sent a colony into the Adriatic, and took possession of an island called Parus §, and afterwards Pharus, which occasioned a war between the ancient inhabitants of that island and the Parians ¶.

C. Nepos observes, that in the time of Miltiades, Pa-

* Herod. l. viii. § 112.

† Thucyd. l. ii. § 9.—Thera was a Lacedæmonian colony. Strab. l. x. p. 741.

‡ Tributarias Atheniensium civitates voluntarias recepit. Just. l. v. c. 7. Xenoph. Hellen. l. ii. Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 226. Vid. Palmerii Exerc. p. 64.

‖ Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 303.

§ Φαρος, ἡ πρότερον Παρος. Pharus, quæ olim Parus. Strab. l. vii. p. 484. Marcian. Herac. Perieg. v. 426.

¶ Diod. Sic. l. xv. p. 336.—The part of the Chronicle yet remaining comes down to the year 354, which is 31 years after the planting of this colony.

ros

ros was "opibus elata," elated with its riches; and Ephorus remarks, that it was then the most flourishing, and the most considerable, of the Cyclades *.

This island is said to have taken its name from Paros, the son of Parasius, an Arcadian. Stephanus tells us, that it was likewise called Pactia, Demetrias, Zacynthus, Hyria, Hyleessa, Minoa, and Cabarnis †.

Archilochus, the inventor or the first improver of the Iambic verse, was a native of Paros ‡. This ancient poet is mentioned by many of the Greek and Roman writers with great encomiums. Horace thought his numbers and poetic spirit worthy of his imitation ‖. Quintilian says, his writings were distinguished by energy of language, comprehensive brevity, striking sentiments, and poignancy of satire §. Valerius Maximus represents him as the greatest poet, or the next to the greatest ¶. Pindar informs us, that one of the

* Παρον δε ευδαιμονεςατην και μεγιςην ουσαν τοτε των Κυκλαδων. Parum vero felicissimam ac maximam eo tempore Cycladum. Ephorus apud Steph. Byzant. in v. Παρος.

If the word μεγιςην means "the largest" of the Cyclades, it is not true. Pliny affirms, that Paros is but half as large as Naxos, which he reckons 75 miles in circuit. Paros therefore must be only 37½, and this, according to M. Tournefort, agrees with the measurement of the natives. Plin. l. iv. c. 12. Tournef. Voyage, let. 5.

† Nicanor apud Steph. Byzant. Plin. loc. cit. Solin. c. 17.

‡ Αρχιλοχος ὁ Παριος, Archilochus ille Parius. Herod. l. i. § 12. Strab. l. x. p. 745.

‖ ——Parios ego primus iambos
Ostendi Latio, numeros animósque secutus
Archilochi.—— Hor. l. i. ep. 19. 23.

§ Summa in Archilocho vis elocutionis, tum validæ, tum breves, vibrantésque sententiæ, &c. Quint. l. x. c. 1.

¶ Maximum poëtam, aut certè summo proximum. Val. Max. l. vi. c. 3. V. Paterc. l. i. c. 5. Cic. Orat. § 1. Id. ad Attic. l. xvi. ep. 11.

5 hymns

hymns of Archilochus was in such estimation, that it was usually sung three times to the honour of those, who had gained the victory at the Olympic games *.

Aristides the rhetorician places him in the first rank of those illustrious poets, who have been an ornament to their country. Homer, he observes, has added a glory to Smyrna, Archilochus to Paros, Hesiod to Bœotia, Simonides to Ceos, Stesichorus to Himera, Pindar to Thebes, Sappho and Alcæus to Mitylene †. "Wise men," says Alcidamus, as quoted by Aristotle, "are respected in all countries. For this reason, Archilochus, though he was the author of some defamatory compositions, was honoured by the Parians ‡."

Some of the foregoing circumstances, and perhaps others of more importance, which are not mentioned by the Greek historians, would have naturally occurred to an ancient writer, composing an inscription for a marble monument in the island of Paros.

But what scheme does our chronologer pursue on this occasion? Does he record the events and revolutions of his own country? Does he mention any of the battles, sieges, treaties, of the Parians? any of their public institutions? any of their poets, patriots, or warriors? Does he mention Archilochus, who was honoured by his countrymen, and distinguished, as a poet, in a general assembly of the Greeks?—Not a syllable on any of

* Pind. Olymp. ix. 1.

† Æl. Arist. in Epit. Alexandri.

‡ Παντες τους σοφους τιμωσι· Παριοι γουν Αρχιλοχον, καιπερ βλασφημον οντα, τετιμηκασι. Omnes sapientes honorant. Parii igitur Archilochum, quamvis maledicum, honorarunt. Apud Arist. Rhet. l. ii. c. 23.

Cicero places Archilochus about the year bef. Chr. 720. Tusc. Quæst. l. i. § 1. C. Nepos, about 668. Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.

 these

these subjects! On the contrary, he rambles from place to place, and records the transactions of Athens, Corinth, Macedon, Lydia, Crete, Cyprus, Sicily, Persia, and other foreign countries, with which Paros had no connection.

In this view, the inscription seems to have been as IMPERTINENT, in the island of Paros, as a marble monument would be in this country, recording the antiquities of France or Spain; or one in Jamaica, containing the revolutions of England.

Upon a supposition, that the inscription is a forgery, it is easy to account for this extraordinary circumstance. A few chronological occurrences, in the ancient history of Paros, would not have been so interesting to the generality of readers; or so valuable, in the estimation of every lover of antiquities; or, in short, so PROFITABLE to the compiler, as a general system of Grecian chronology.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

IV. IT has been frequently observed, that the earlier periods of the Grecian history are involved in darkness and confusion.

Several of the ancients inform us, that the first writers of Greece were poets *, whose chief object was to amuse their readers, or to excite their admiration, by marvellous details, by personifying all parts of nature, and by introducing a multitude of imaginary divinities.

In the earliest accounts of that country, we meet with scarcely any thing but poetical fictions, the genealogies, the amours, and the adventures of gods and demi-gods †. These mythological tales are incompatible with a regular chronology.

Herodotus, who wrote 444 years before the Christian æra ‡, and is emphatically styled the father of history ||,

* Προτερον μεν εν ποιημασιν εξεφερον οι φιλοσοφοι τα δογματα, και τους λογους, ωσπερ Ορφευς, και Ἡσιοδος, και Παρμενιδης, και Ξενοφανης, και Εμπεδοκλης, και Θαλης. Antiquitùs carmine suas sententias philosophi proferebant, ut Orpheus, Hesiodus, Parmenides, Xenophanes, Empedocles, Thales. Plut de Pyth. Orac. p. 402. Strab. l. i. p. 34. Prosam orationem condere Pherecydes Syrius instituit, Cyri regis ætate. Plin. l. vii. c. 56.—Pherecydes wrote about 540 years before Christ.

† Και οι πρωτοι δε ιστορικοι, και φυσικοι, μυθογραφοι. Et quidem primi etiam historici, ac naturæ rerum descriptores, fabulas scripserunt. Strab. l. i. p. 37.

‡ Herodotus was born in the year bef. Chr. 484, and died some time after the year 432. Vid. l. ix. § 73. A. Gell. l. xv. c. 23. Corsini Fasti Attici, tom. iii. p. 157. 213. &c.

|| Pater historiæ. Cic. de Leg. l. i. § 5. Princeps genus hoc ornavit. Id. de Orat. l. ii. § 36.

seems to have related all the memorable occurrences he could find in the history of the Lydians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, and other nations, within the compass of 240 years; continuing his narrative to the taking of Sestus *, or the conclusion of the Persian war in 479. But he is irregular and desultory, and seems to have had no idea of any chronological order or precision. His utmost efforts, in this department of history, consists in determining the length of a reign, and in a vague and general computation of time by the ages of men. Thus, he says, "the Heraclidæ, or the descendents of Hercules, possessed the kingdom of Lydia for the space of 505 years, during twenty-two γενεας ανδρων, generations of men †." "Semiramis lived, γενεῃσι πεντε, five generations, before another queen, whose name was Nitocris ‡." He mentions the Argonautic expedition,

* Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 29.

† Herod. l. i. § 7. In this passage Herodotus makes a generation consist of near 23 years. But in book ii. § 142. he tells us, that "three generations are equivalent to a hundred years." Ancient writers observed no consistency in the use of the word γενεα. Sometimes they employed it to express a certain number of years, and sometimes a succession of father and son, or the extent of a reign. Herodoti γενεα, says Vossius, constituit annos 33⅓.—Γενεα Græcis grammaticis aliquando est spatium 20, aliquando 25, 30, 33, nonnumquam etiam plurium annorum. Imo etiam 100 aliquando: uti est apud Theophrastum; vel etiam 110 annorum intervallum continet γενεα, ut docet Phlegon. Rectè itàque notatum Porphyrio, quanto vetustiores, tanto longiores esse γενεας. If. Vossii Castig. Hornii de Ætate Mundi, c. 6. Grævii Lect. Hesiod. c. 4. p. 21. Censor. c. 17.

‡ Herod. l. i. § 184.—According to Herodotus, § 188, Nitocris was "the mother of Labynetus," or Nabonedus, supposed to be the Belshazzar of the scriptures, in whose reign Babylon was taken, bef. Chr. 539. On a supposition that she was the wife of Evilmerodach; that Evilmerodach was the son of Nebuchadnezzar; and that she assumed the government of the kingdom, soon after

pedition, the Trojan war, and other ancient events; but he never attempts to ascertain the time, when those persons lived, or those transactions occurred, by referring them to any known and determinate epocha.

The antiquity, which he ascribes to the kings of Egypt, is extravagant and incredible. The Egyptians, he says, reckoned from Menes to Sethon, 341 generations, or 11,340 years *; from Bacchus to Amasis, 15,000 †; and from Hercules to Amasis, 17,000 ‡. He seems to have collected his materials, according to

after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, in the year 562, the five generations of Herodotus will extend no higher, than to the year 728.

Sir Isaac Newton thinks, this remarkable queen was the wife of Nabonassar, the author of the famous astronomical æra, which commenced bef. Chr. 747. Chron. p. 281. Scaliger imagines, that Nitocris was the wife of Nebuchadnezzar, and that she governed the kingdom during the madness of her husband; and that the Semiramis of Herodotus was the celebrated wife of Ninus. Upon this principle, instead of πεντε, five, he would read πεντηκοντα, fifty generations; that is, 1666 years, which will place Semiramis about the year bef. Chr. 2228. Not. ad Fragm. apud Emend. Temp. p. 14. 42.

Though it is perhaps impossible to find either truth or consistency in the history of Semiramis, and the origin of the Babylonian empire, yet the Mosaic account of the early settlement of mankind in the land of Shinar, or Babylonia, favours the supposition of their high antiquity. See an account of the Babylonian calculations in the notes to Chap. III.

* Herod. l. ii. § 142.—If three generations were equivalent to a hundred years, 341 generations were equivalent to 11,366 years and eight months.

† Id. l. ii. § 145.

‡ Id. l. ii. § 43.—Sethon began to reign about the year bef. Chr. 719 or 722. Amasis about 568 or 569. Usserii Annal. Jackson's Chron. Antiq. vol. ii. p. 230, 240.

the

the usual custom of travellers, from report *, or tradition; and very seldom alleges the authority of preceding writers.

Thucydides, who was thirteen years younger than Herodotus †, begins his history with a short account of ancient Greece, and briefly relates the events, which happened between the retreat of Xerxes in 480, where Herodotus ends, and the Peloponnesian war, comprehending a period of fifty years inclusively. After these preliminaries, he proceeds, in the second book, to the great object he had in view, the history of that war, which commenced in the spring of the year, bef. Chr. 431 (when Pythodorus had been ten months archon at Athens) and lasted twenty-seven years and six months. In this work he records the transactions of every summer and winter in a regular series ‡, and concludes with an account of the victory obtained by the Athenian fleet at Cynossema ‖, and a cursory view of some other events, which happened about autumn in 411, or the twenty-first year of the Peloponnesian war. Thucydides died before he had completed his design, and left his eighth book unfinished §.

* Κατα ακουω, "as I have heard." l. ii. § 99. See also l. ii. § 3. 5. 10. 12. 29. 55. 79. 100. 102. 116. 120. 122. 123. 127, &c.

† A. Gell. l. xv. c. 23.—Thucydides was born in the year bef. Chr. 471, and died in 391.

‡ The summer, as Thucydides divides the year, extends from the vernal to the autumnal, and the winter from the autumnal to the vernal, equinox.

‖ Κυνος σημα, canis sepulchrum; called by Diodorus Ἑκαβης μνημειον, Hecubæ monumentum. Diod. l. xiii. p. 167.

§ The eighth book concludes with this remark, which seems to have been added by another hand: "When the winter following this summer shall be ended, the twenty-first year of the war will be also completed."

The

The history of the Peloponnesian war, from the year 411, to its conclusion in 404, and the history of the subsequent affairs of Greece, is continued by Xenophon *, through a period of 48 † or 49 years, ending with the battle of Mantinea, and the death of Epaminondas in 362 ‡.

These two histories comprehend a period of seventy years, in the form of ANNALS; and this form, as far as it extends, may be thought a sufficient notation of time. But many incidental circumstances, many antecedent events, are related without any chronological distinction, or reference to any memorable epocha.

This account of the imperfect state of chronology, in the time of these historians, corresponds with the following observation, made by the very learned and accurate Sir John Marsham.

Sanè *ἱστορικον* scribendi genus longè vetustius est, quàm *χρονολογικον*. Priscis historicis nuda fuit rerum gestarum narratio; nec certis temporum intervallis distincta; nec à termino fixo deducta. In hâc classe censendi sunt Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, et qui perierunt reliqui; quorum scripta, antequam nata esset ars chronologica, prodierunt. Hi, licèt Olympiorum aliquando obiter meminerint, tetraëtericam tamen Olympiadum computationem non agnoscunt ‖.

* Some think there is a chasm of near two years between the period, at which the history of Thucydides ends, and the Grecian history of Xenophon begins. Usserii Annal. sub an. J. Per. 4303. But Dodwell denies, that there is any such hiatus; and his opinion is now generally followed. Dodwell de Cyclis Vet. diss. viii. § 20. p. 342.—Xenophon was born about the year 450, and died in 360, at the age of ninety. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 56. Lucian. in Macrob.

† Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 169.

‡ Id. l. xv. p. 395. Corsin. Fast. Attic. vol. iv. p. 17.

‖ Canon. Chron. sec. xvi. p. 486.

Thucydides,

Thucydides, in order to ascertain the time of an event, which happened in the LXXXVIII Olympiad, does not specify the number of the Olympiad, but mentions it in these terms: "It was that Olympiad, in which Dorieus the Rhodian was the second time victorious *." When the Olympiads began to be used in chronology, they were distinguished by their respective numbers.

The series of Olympiads, archons, and ephori, in Xenophon's Grecian history, is the interpolation of some impertinent annotator †.

Historians had not yet fixed upon any certain epocha, from which they might deduce their chronological computations. Neither the destruction of Troy, the institution of the Olympic games, nor the foundation of any city, was employed for that purpose.

It is very observable, that, at this period, historical records were so scarce, or so defective, that even the most inquisitive and the best informed writers were unacquainted with the revolutions and the most remarkable transactions of neighbouring kingdoms, which happened within a century of their own time ‡. Thus Herodotus and Xenophon differ EXTREMELY, in the accounts they give of several important circumstances in the history of Cyrus the Great, particularly with respect to

* Thucyd. l. iii. § 8.

† Ineptissima ista Olympiadum, archontum, ephororum συγχυσις, quæ in Hellenica Xenophontis irrepsit, glossatoris cujuspiam inscitiam prodit. Marsh. Can. Chron. sec. xvi. p. 487. Dodwell, Præl. Academ. inaug. § 7. Id. de Cyclis Vet. diss. viii. § 23. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iii. c. 4. vol. ii. p. 73.

‡ Cyrus died in the year bef. Chr. 529. Herodotus was born at Halicarnassus, in Asia Minor, in the year 484; and Xenophon about 34 years afterwards. The latter accompanied the younger Cyrus into Persia.

the birth and the death of that prince, and the eſtabliſhment of the Perſian empire.

Herodotus relates, that Cyrus was the ſon of Cambyſes, a Perſian of inferior rank, and Mandane, the daughter of Aſtyages; that, in conſequence of a dream, his grandfather Aſtyages ordered, that he ſhould be put to death in his infancy; that, contrary to his directions, he was preſerved, and educated among ſhepherds; that when he was grown to maturity, he dethroned Aſtyages, and transferred the empire to the Perſians; that, after a reign of twenty-five years, he was ſlain in battle, by the forces of Tomyris, queen of the Maſſagetes, who cut off his head, and threw it into a veſſel full of human blood, with a ſarcaſtic reflection on his cruelty and ambition *.

Xenophon, on the contrary, informs us, that Cambyſes was king of Perſia; that Cyrus was educated in his father's court; that when he was twelve years of age, he went with his mother Mandane to viſit Aſtyages, who entertained him with great liberality and affection; that Aſtyages died in peace, and left his kingdom to his ſon Cyaxares; and laſtly, that Cyrus, after a reign of conqueſts and glory, died, like a philoſopher, in his own palace, ſurrounded by his family and his friends.

Cteſias, in his account of this prince, differs from Herodotus and Xenophon in almoſt every circumſtance †. Diodorus ſays, he was taken captive by the

* Herod. l. i. § 107, &c.

† Ταυτα λεγει Κτησιας περι Κυρου, και ουχ οια Ἡροδοτος. Hæc dicit Cteſias de Cyro, iis quæ ab Herodoto referuntur diſſimilia. Cteſiæ Fragm. apud Phot. Bibl. cod. 72. Herod. Op. p. 822.—Cteſias was of Cnidus, and attended the younger Cyrus in his Perſian expedition.

queen of the Scythians, and crucified *. Joannes Malala relates, that he was killed in a sea-fight with the Samians; and for the truth of this assertion, he cites a history, falsely ascribed to Pythagoras †.

Xenophon's Cyropædia, I know, is generally regarded as a moral or political romance. But it may be observed, that the author himself disclaims this idea ‡; and that a judicious writer would scarcely venture to form a romance on a recent period of history, in direct opposition to public records and well-known facts ‖. On the other hand, if there were no records, and those facts were generally unknown, or sunk into oblivion, the argument I would draw from the different accounts, given of this celebrated hero by Herodotus, Xenophon, and others, remains in its full force.

About four hundred years before the Christian æra, Hippias the Elean published a catalogue of the victors at the Olympic games §. This catalogue, as Plutarch observes, was written οψε, late, that is, 376 years after the first Olympiad, in which Corœbus was victor in the

* Ανεςαυρωσι, cruci affixit. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 128.

† Malalæ Chron. p. 201. Cedren. p. 114.

‡ Xenophon, in the beginning of his Cyropædia, tells us, "that he had taken great pains to inform himself of Cyrus's birth, education, and character; and that he would not advance any thing, but what had been told him."

‖ Strabo, Plutarch, Q. Curtius, Arrian, and others, agree, that Cyrus was buried at Pasargadæ in PERSIA; which is hardly consistent with the story of Herodotus. Strab. l. xv. p. 1061. Plut. in v. Alex. p. 703. Q. Curt. l. x. c. 1. Arrian. l. vi. sub fin.

See Prid. Connect. an. 530, where the author gives several reasons, why he thinks Xenophon's account of the death of Cyrus is more probable, than that of Herodotus.

§ Των Ολυμπιονικων αναγραφη, Olympionicarum Recensio. Plut. in v. Numæ, § 1. Schol. ad Theoc. Idyl. 4.

stadion;

ſtadion; but, what is worſe, he affirms, that it was "a performance of no authority *." Yet, as the direction of the games properly belonged to the people of Elis †, Hippias may be ſuppoſed to have had the beſt information, which could be obtained. His publication however ſeems to have been but a bare liſt of names, merely calculated to diſtinguiſh the victors, and excite emulation in others ‡, without being applied to any chronological purpoſe.

About the year 338, Ephorus of Cuma in Æolia, one of the diſciples of Iſocrates, wrote a hiſtory of Greece and other countries, from the return of the Heraclidæ into Peloponneſus ‖, to the ſiege of Perinthus by Philip of Macedon, in the year 340, comprehending a period of 750 years §. He is ſaid to have diſtributed his materials into different books κατα γενος, "according to the nature of the ſubject ¶;" but we are not told, that he obſerved the order of time. His veracity is called in queſtion by ſeveral ancient writers **.

Calliſthenes and Theopompus lived at the ſame time. The former was Ariſtotle's relation, and attended Alexander in his expedition into Aſia. Among other productions ††, he wrote a hiſtory of Greece, entitled, Ἑλληνικα,

* Απ᾿ ουδενος ὁρμωμενου αναγκαιου προς πιστιν. Nullis certis fultum argumentis. Plut. loc. cit.

† Strab. l. viii. p. 544, 545.

‡ Pauſan. in Eliac. l. vi. c. 6.

‖ The return of the Heraclidæ is placed by the generality of chronologiſts bef. Chr. 1103, or 1104 years.

§ Diod. Sic. l. iv. § 1. Id. l. xvi. p. 468.

¶ Κατα γενος, in certum rerum genus. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 286.

** Id. l. i. p. 37. Sen. Nat. Quæſt. l. vii. c. 16. Cenſor. c. 17.

†† A ſpurious hiſtory of Alexander the Great, under the name of Calliſthenes, is ſaid to be, or to have been, extant in manuſcript, in

Ἑλληνικα, Hellenica, which commenced at the year bef. Chr. 394.

The latter was a disciple of Isocrates, and likewise wrote a history of Greece, in twelve books, beginning where Thucydides ends, and concluding with the sea-fight near Cnidus, in 395, including a period of seventeen years *. Diodorus observes, that these three writers, "Ephorus, Callisthenes, and Theopompus, did not attempt to relate the occurrences of ancient times, because they would not admit of any chronological computation †." Cicero informs us, that Callisthenes wrote a narrative of the siege of Troy ‡. But this work might have no more chronology in it, than the Iliad of Homer.

Timæus Siculus lived in the time of Ptolemy Soter and Philadelphus, and is said to have been the author of a work, entitled, Ολυμπιονικαι η Χρονικα Πραξιδια, Olympionicæ seu Acta Chronica ‖. Polybius tells us, that this writer compared the times of the Ephori with the kings of Sparta; and the archons at Athens, and the priestesses of Juno at Argos, with the Olympic vic-

several libraries. Casaub. ad Scalig. epist. 402. 413. Voss. de Hist. Græc. l. i. c. 9. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iii. c. 8. vol. ii. p. 212.

The fragment, which Fabricius quotes from Berkelius, as the beginning of the Pseudo-Callisthenes, is the production of *another writer*. Bibl. Græc. l. vi. c. 12. vol. xiv. p. 148. Vide Berkel. ad Steph. Byzant. in v. Βουκεφαλεια.

* Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 303.

† Απεςησαν των παλειων μυθων, à priscis fabulis abstinuerunt. Diod. Sic. l. iv. § 1. Ἡ δε των χρονων απαγγελια τον ακριβεςατον ελεγχον ου προσδεχομενη, καταφρονειν ποιει της ἱςοριας τους αναγινωσκοντας. Et temporum notatio cum exacta supputationis argumenta non admittat, in causâ est ut historiam lector aspernetur. Ibid.

‡ Callisthenes Troicum bellum [à perpetuâ suâ historiâ separavit.] Cic. Epist. ad Famil. l. v. 12.

‖ Suidas.

tors.

tors *. And Diodorus Siculus obſerves, that he was extremely accurate in the notation of time †.

Yet, notwithſtanding this high encomium, he was uſually ſtyled γραοσυλλεκτρια ‡, which implies, that, with reſpect to his hiſtorical compilations, he was a mere old woman. Polybius gives us this character of him: "His works are filled with dreams, prodigies, and incredible romances; in ſhort, with the groſſeſt ſuperſtition, and the wonderful ſtories of old women ‖." Clemens Alexandrinus likewiſe repreſents him as a fabulous writer §.

Eratoſthenes was one of the diſciples of Callimachus. He was born in the year bef. Chr. 276, and died in 196, or 194, at the age of eighty ¶, or eighty-two **. He was made keeper of the royal library at

* Ὁ γαρ τας συγκρισεις ποιουμενος ανεκαθεν των Εφορων προς τους βασιλεις τους εν Λακεδαιμονι, και τους αρχοντας τους εν Αθηνησι, καὶ τας ιερειας τας εν Αργει παραβαλλων προς τους Ολυμπιονικας, ουτος εςι. Hic enim ille eſt, qui ephoros, à primâ inſtitutione, cum regibus Spartanorum comparat; et archontes Athenienſium et ſacerdotes Junonis apud Argivos, cum Olympicis victoribus confert. Valeſii Excerpta ex Polyb. l. xii. p. 50.

† Τιμαιος μεν ουν μεγιςην προνοιαν πεποιημενος της των χρονων ακριβειας. Timæus maximam diligentiam adhibuit in exquiſitâ temporum notatione. Diod. Sic. l. v. § 1.

‡ Suidas in v. Τιμαιος.

‖ Εν δε ταις ιδιαις αποφασεσιν, ενυπνιων, και τερατων, και μυθων απιθανων, και συλληβδην, δεισιδαιμονιας αγενους, και τερατειας γυναικωδους, εςι πληρης. In ſuis verò narrationibus ipſe ſomniis et prodigiis refertus eſt, et fabulis ab omni fide remotis; ac poſtremò degeneri ac muliebri ſuperſtitione. Valeſii Excerpt. ex Polyb. l. xii. p. 56. Suid. in v. Δεισιδαιμονια.

§ Θεοπομπῳ μεν και Τιμαιῳ μυθους και βλασφημιας συνταττουσιν. Theopompo et Timæo, qui fabulas et maledicta componunt. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 1. p. 316.

¶ Suidas. Corſini Faſti Attici, tom. iv. p. 94.

** Lucian. in Macrobiis. Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 182.

Alexandria by Ptolemy Euergetes, on the death of Zenodotus; and continued in that office to the ninth or the eleventh year of Epiphanes. He wrote a great number of books in different ſciences. By the order of Ptolemy [Euergetes] he made a catalogue of the kings, who reigned at Thebes in Egypt, which he collected from the records of that city, and the tradition of the prieſts. The liſt extends from Menes to Amurthæus or Amuthantæus, and contains a ſeries of 38 kings, who reigned in ſucceſſion, during a period of 1076 years. It was preſerved by Apollodorus, and is extant in the Chronographia of Syncellus *; but its authority is queſtionable.

The Ολυμπιονικαι of Eratoſthenes are cited by Diogenes Laertius, and Athenæus †; and his Χρονολογια or Χρονογραφιαι, by Syncellus, Harpocration, and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus ‡. In the opinion of Dionyſius, "Eratoſthenes uſed accurate canons" in his Chronography ||.

It may not therefore be improper to ſubjoin ſome general principles of his chronology, as they are tranſmitted to us by Clemens Alexandrinus §.

	Years.
From the taking of Troy to the return of the Heraclidæ - - - -	80
From that time to the ſettlement of Ionia -	60

* Syncell. p. 91—147.——According to the computation of Syncellus, who gives us this catalogue of Eratoſthenes, Menes began his reign 2600 years, and Amuthantæus died 1524 years, before the Chriſtian æra.

† Diog. Laert. in v. Emped. l. viii. § 51. Athen. l. iv. c. 13. p. 154.

‡ Syncell. p. 194. Harpoc. in v. ευηνος. Dionyſ. Halic. l. i. p. 60.

|| Εισιν οἱ κανονες ὑγιεις, οἱς Ερατοσθενης κεχρηται. Sunt incorruptæ regulæ, quibus Eratoſthenes uſus eſt. Dionyſ. Halic. loc. cit.

§ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.

	Years.
From that time to the guardianship of Lycurgus	159
From that time to the first Olympiad - -	108
From that time to the invasion of Xerxes -	297
From that time to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war - - -	48
From that time to the end of the war - -	27
From that time to the battle at Leuctra * -	34
From that time to the death of Philip - -	35
From that time to the death of Alexander -	12

The accuracy of some of these numbers, as they stand in the Stromata of Clemens, is confirmed by a passage of Dionysius Halicarnasseus, from which we learn, that the four hundred and thirty-second year after the destruction of Troy was, according to the canons of Eratosthenes, the first year of the seventh Olympiad †.

As Eratosthenes had the use of the Alexandrian library, he had advantages in his chronological researches, which none of his predecessors enjoyed. But this was long after the year, in which the Parian Chronicle is supposed to have been compiled. That work was engraved in 264, when Eratosthenes was only twelve years of age; and he was not invited from Athens till the year 239 ‡, twenty-five years afterwards. The Chronicle therefore could not be copied from the writings of Eratosthenes. Besides, the computations of

* Ετη τριακοντα τεσσαρα.—The Latin translation, in the editions of Sylburgius and Potter, makes it only XXX years: I suppose by mistake.

† Dionys. Halic. loc. cit.

‡ Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 121. and Chronol. Table at the end of the fourth volume. Saxius supposes, that Eratosthenes was not appointed keeper of the Alexandrian library, before the year 226. Onomastic. p. 109.

the

the Chronicle, and that of Eratosthenes, are very different in some important articles, as it will appear hereafter.

Apollodorus, an Athenian, the disciple of Aristarchus the grammarian, and Panætius the philosopher, was the author of several treatises on the fabulous and heroic ages of Greece, particularly the following: 1. Περι Θεων, Of the Gods, a work of considerable extent. 2. Βιβλιοθηκα, a genealogical and mythological work. The part of it now remaining, which scarcely consists of three books, ends abruptly with an account of some of the exploits of Theseus. From passages cited by the ancients, the learned Dr. Gale and others infer, that the History of the Gods, and the Bibliotheca, were different productions *. 3. Χρονικα or Χρονικη Συνταξις †, Temporum Ordo & Structura, extending from the siege of Troy to the time when the author wrote, which was about the year bef. Chr. 140, or something later ‡, This work is said to have been composed in tragiambic verse ‖.

* Errant, qui [Bibliothecam] idem opus cum libris Περι Θεων faciunt. Galei Differt. de Script. Mythol. c. 5.—Dr. Gale likewise proves, that the Bibliotheca is not an EPITOME of the History of the Gods, as some writers have supposed. Ibid.

† Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 222.

‡ Apollodorus mentions the death of Carneades, in the CLXII. 4. Olympiad, bef. Chr. 129. Diog. Laert. l. iv. § 65.

> Συνεταξε τα περι [απο] της Τρωϊκης ἁλωσεως,
> Χρονογραφιαν ςοιχουσαν αχρι του νυν βιου.
>
> Conscripsit à Trojæ excidio,
> Chronographiam versibus descriptam ad hoc usque tempus.
>
> Marc. Heracl. sive Scymni Chii Perieg. v. 22.

This author wrote in the year bef. Chr. 132. Corsini Fasti Attici, tom. iv. p. 107.

‖ A. Gellius, l. xvii. c. 4. cites three verses from the Chronica of Apollodorus.

The

The writings of Apollodorus naturally ſuggeſt the two following obſervations:

1. Though the Bibliotheca was written 120 years after the date of the Parian Chronicle, it does not contain the ſmalleſt traces of a ſyſtematical chronology.

2. The chronicle of Apollodorus is quoted by many eminent writers of antiquity *; while that of Paros, which comprehends a more extenſive period, is entirely unnoticed.

About the ſame time † Polybius wrote his Univerſal Hiſtory ‡, originally conſiſting of forty books, of which five only are now remaining, with extracts and fragments of ſome others. The firſt and ſecond books form a ſort of introduction to the reſt. In the third the author enters upon his principal ſubject, which was a hiſtory of the moſt conſiderable tranſactions of the Romans, and other nations, from the year 220, or the commencement of the ſecond Carthaginian war, to the fall of the Macedonian empire, in 168 ‖.

Polybius is the moſt ancient writer now extant, that has adopted the method of aſcertaining the dates of civil and military tranſactions by the Olpmpiads. But his hiſtory, excepting the ſhort ſketches contained in the

* Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Plutarch, Phlegon, A. Gellius, Lucian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Diogenes Laertius *paſſim*, Euſebius, Stephanus Byzantinus, &c.

† Polybius was born bef. Chr. 205 years, and died 123.

‡ Ἱϛορικη Καθολικη. Polyb. l. ii. c. 37.

‖ Strabo informs us, that Polybius was preſent at the burning of Corinth by L. Mummius, in the year 146; that he had given an account of that event in his hiſtory; and particularly lamented the deſtruction, which was made by the Roman ſoldiers, of many beautiful pictures, and other works of ingenuity, when they plundered the city. Strab. l. viii. p. 584.

The fifth book of Polybius ends with the CXL Olympiad, bef. Chr. 217.

two preliminary books, included the events of only 53 years, many of which happened within the compass of his own life, and does not display any great extent of chronological science.

About this time chronology began to assume a new form, and to be established on more solid, regular, and scientific principles. The Greek historians, in general, made use of the Olympiads in the computation of time. Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, and others, will shew us, how this epocha was regularly continued in subsequent ages. But as no records had been kept, before the establishment of the Olympiads, in the time of Corœbus; and no great accuracy observed in the Olympic catalogues, till they began to be applied to historical purposes, the transactions of preceding ages still remained in a state of obscurity and confusion; and all that the ablest chronologers could afterwards accomplish, was a precarious system, founded on the loose calculations, or the arbitrary assertions, of more ancient authors.

I am very sensible, that several writers, besides those I have mentioned, published Olympic catalogues; particularly Aristotle, Demetrius Phalereus, Philochorus, Aristarchus, Stesiclides, Hippostratus, Phlegon, &c. * But

* Aristotle. Ολυμπιονικαι, Olympionicæ. Diog. Laert. in v. Arist. l. v. § 26.

Demetrius Phalereus. Των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη, Archontum Recensio. Diog. Laert. in v. Thal. l. i. § 22. See below, chap. x.

Philochorus. This writer was an Athenian, and lived about 200 years bef. Chr. Vid. Suid.

Aristarchus. ὁ των Ολυμπιαδων εξηγητης, Olympiadum enarrator. Pausan. l. v. c. 20.

Stesiclides. Των Αρχοντων και Ολυμπιονικων Αναγραφη. Diog. Laert. in v. Xenoph. l. ii. § 56.

Hippostratus. v. Jons. de Script. Hist. Phil. l. iv. § 41.

Phlegon.

But from what has been obſerved in the writings of the Greeks, from Herodotus to Polybius, we can find no traces of a regular ſcientific chronology.

Let us conſider the ſentiments of the ancients on this ſubject.

Phlegon. Ολυμπιονικων και χρονικων συναγωγη, Olympionicarum & Chronicorum Sylloge. Phot. cod. 97.

CHAP. VI.

JULIUS Africanus, in this *Χρονογραφια*, which extends from the creation to the year after Christ 221, asserts, "that the Greeks had no accurate history before the Olympiads; and that all their accounts of preceding ages are confused and inconsistent *."

Justin Martyr likewise observes, "that the Greeks had no accurate history before the Olympiads †." Justin wrote about the year 140.

Plutarch, an author of great learning and judgement, ventures no farther into Grecian antiquity, than the time of Theseus. When he attempts to give his readers the history of that hero, he says, "As geographers throw into the extremities of their maps those countries, which are unknown to them, remarking at the same time, that all beyond is nothing but hills of sand, and haunts of wild beasts, frozen seas, marshes, and mountains, inaccessible to human courage and industry; so in comparing the lives of illustrious men, when I have passed through the periods of time, which may be described with probability, and where history may find a

* *Μεχρι μεν Ολυμπιαδων, ουδεν ακριβες ἱςορηται τοις Ἑλλησι, παντων συγκεχυμενων, και κατα μηδεν αὐτοις των πρωτου συμφωνουντων.* Ante quidem Olympiades nihil certi à Græcis in historiâ traditur, omnibus confusis, nec ullâ ex parte sibi anteà consentientibus. Afric. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 10. Syncell. p. 154.—Africanus died about the year of Christ 232. Cave.

† *Ὁτι ουδεν Ἑλλησι προ των Ολυμπιαδων ακριβες ἱςορηται.* Nihil à Græcis ante Olympiades, accuratè scriptum esse. Just. Mart. ad Græc. Cohort. p. 13, edit. 1686.—Justin was born about the year 89, and died in 164. Fabricius.

sure

sure footing in facts, I may say of the remoter ages, that all beyond is full of prodigy and fiction, the region of poets and fabulists, wrapt in clouds, and unworthy of belief *."

Plutarch's ne plus ultra is not much more than half a century before the siege of Troy; for Theseus is said to have carried away Hellen from Sparta, about 24 years before that event †.

This excellent writer takes notice of the inconsistencies of the Greek historians in many points of chronology, concerning some of the most illustrious characters, and the most important transactions of later times, in which we might have expected a general agreement. Thus, he says, "there is nothing but uncertainty and contradiction in the accounts, which historians have given us of Lycurgus, the celebrated Spartan lawgiver. Some say, he was contemporary with Iphitus, and joined with him in settling the cessation of arms, during the Olympic games ‡. Aristotle the philosopher is of this opinion, and endeavours to support it by an Olympic disc, on which the name of Lycurgus was inscribed.

* Plut. in v. Thesei, p. 1.—Plutarch wrote about the year aft. Chr. 120.

† Sir Isaac Newton places the birth of Theseus 74 years before the siege of Troy. Chron. an. 938.

‡ The Olympic games are supposed to have been first instituted by the Idæan Hercules, in the fabulous ages of Greece. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 230. After many interruptions they were restored by Iphitus, prince of Elis, 884 years bef. Chr. the year in which Lycurgus gave his laws to the Lacedæmonians. But the names of the victors were not recorded, till the XXVIII Olympiad, in the year 776, when Corœbus of Elis was victor in the race. This was the first Olympiad, which the Greeks used in their chronological computations; yet these Olympiads are confounded by several authors. Aristod. apud Syncell. p. 196. Athen. l. xiv. p. 635. Pausan. l. v. c. 4.

 Others,

Others, as Eratosthenes and Apollodorus *, computing the time by the succession of the Spartan kings, place him much earlier than the first Olympiad †."

In another place he says, "Some authors think they can prove by chronological arguments, that the story, concerning the interview between Solon and Crœsus, is a fiction. But a story so famous, attested by such a number of witnesses, and, what still more deserves to be considered, so agreeable to Solon's character, and so worthy of his magnanimity and wisdom, should not, in my opinion, be rejected, upon a pretence of its not agreeing with some chronological canons ‡, as they are called, which thousands continue to this day endeavouring to correct, without being able to bring them to any consistency ||."

In this instance, we find the date of a most important transaction, in the most polished state of Greece, the legislation of Solon at Athens, a subject of dispute and uncertainty.

Josephus asserts, that the ancient Greek writers destroy one another's credit; that the genealogies of Hesiod are corrected by Acusilaus §; that Acusilaus is

* Eratosthenes placed the legislation of Lycurgus 299 years after the siege of Troy; that is, bef. Chr. 884. And Apollodorus agreed with him in this computation. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.

† Plut. in v. Lycurgi, § 1.

‡ Plutarch seems to allude to the canons of Eratosthenes.

|| Plut. in v. Solonis, p. 93.——According to Corsini, Solon was archon in 594; went into Lydia, during the tyranny of Pisistratus, in 560; and died the year following. Fasti Attici, tom. iii. p. 99. But see A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21. Diog. Laert. l. i. § 59.

§ Clemens Alexandrinus informs us, that Eumelus and Acusilaus turned some of Hesiod's poems into prose, and then published them as their own compositions. Strom. l. vi. § 2. p. 752.

condemned

condemned by Hellenicus, Hellenicus accused of falshood by Ephorus, Ephorus by Timæus, Timæus by his successors, and Herodotus by all the world *.

Varro, who is applauded by Cicero, Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Seneca, and Quintilian †, for his profound learning and knowledge of antiquities, divided the time, anterior to his own age, into three parts. "The first," he says, "extends from the beginning of the world to the Ogygian deluge ‡; and may be called, αδηλον, the obscure or unknown period. The second extends from the deluge to the first Olympiad, and is called μυθικον, fabulous. The third extends from the first Olympiad to the present time, and is called ιϛορικον, the historic æra ||."

Thucydides, in the beginning of his history, remarks, that "the transactions of an earlier date [than the Peloponnesian war] and those which were still more ancient, could not, through length of time, be adequately known §."

But

* Ἡροδοτον δε παντες. Jos. cont. Ap. l. i. § 3.—Josephus was born A. D. 37, and brought down his Antiquities to the year 94; but how long he lived afterwards is not known. Lib. xx. sub fin.

† Cicero de claris Orat. § 60. Dionys. Halic. l. ii. p. 92. Sen. Consol. ad Helv. c. 8. Quint. l. x. 1.

‡ Ant. Chr. 1796. Banier.

|| Varro tria discrimina temporum esse tradit, Primum, ab hominum principio ad cataclysmum priorem, quod propter ignorantiam vocetur αδηλον. Secundum, à cataclysmo priore ad Olympiadem primam; quod, quia in eo multa fabulosa referuntur, μυθικον nominatur. Tertium, à primâ Olympiade ad nos, quod dicitur ιϛορικον, quia res in eo gestæ, veris historiis continentur. Varronis Fragm. p. 219. Censor. de Die Nat. c. 21. Varro died bef. Chr. 26 years. Eusebius.

§ Τα προ αυτων, και τα ετι παλαιοτερα, σαφως μεν ευρειν, δια χρονου πληθος, αδυνατον ην. Quæ ante [motus Peloponnesiacos gesta] et quæ

etiam

But the most important observation on this subject occurs in Diodorus Siculus, who informs us, that, when he undertook to write his Historical Library, "he travelled through many parts of Europe and Asia, in order to view those places, which he had occasion to mention, and to examine every thing, which might be of service to him in his undertaking; and that he spent thirty years in composing this work *."

Yet after all his enquiries he declares, that "he did not attempt to circumscribe those times, which preceded the Trojan war, because he could find no PARAPEGMA, on which he could place any dependence †."

In this passage the word PARAPEGMA has been variously interpreted. The Latin translators, Rhodoman and Wesselingius, render it, "certitudinis fulcrum." Sir Isaac Newton accordingly translates μηδεν παραπηγμα πιστευομενον, "no certain foundation to rely upon." Scaliger calls parapegma, tempus certum & definitum; and adds, "id autem duplex est, undè et quò. Hoc est, undè rationes temporum deducuntur, et quò referuntur." Marsham styles it, terminus fixus; Stillingfleet, "a certain fixed epocha, or a certain fixed period of time."

etiam antiquiora, liquidò investigari, propter temporis longinquitatem, non potuerunt. Thucyd. l. i. § 1.

* Τριακοντα μεν ετη περι αυτην επραγματευθημεν, μετα δε πολλης κακοπαθειας και κινδυνων επηλθομεν πολλην της τε Ασιας και της Ευρωπης, ἱνα των αναγκαιοτατων, και πλειστων μερων αυτοπται γενηθωμεν. Triginta annorum operam in id [argumentum] contulimus, magnamque Asiæ & Europæ partem, non absque periculis & ærumnis, perlustravimus; ut pleraque, et maximè instituto huic necessaria, loca inspiceremus ipsi. Diod. in Procem. Just. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 10. Diodorus flourished bef. Chr. 60 years. Blount.

† Τους μεν [χρονους] προ των Τρωϊκων ου διοριζομεθα βεβαιως, δια το μηδεν ΠΑΡΑΠΗΓΜΑ παρειληφεναι περι τουτων πιστευομενον. Quæ Troïca præcesserunt, non definimus certo spatio; quia nullum sumi potest PARAPEGMA, cui fidendum. Diod. in Procem. p. 5.

time *." Suidas explains it by the word κανων, regula. But Salmasius censures the interpreters of Diodorus, and other learned men, for their ignorance and hallucination, with respect to this term, and then proceeds to define it in this manner: "Interpretes Diodori firmamentum exponunt. Scaliger ad Eusebium, quod alii ἐποχην, Censorinus titulum vocat, id Diodoro dici παραπηγμα, hoc est, terminum fixum et hærentem. Παραπηγμα propriè est quicquid adfigitur. Hinc παραπηγματα tabulæ dicebantur adfixæ columnis, aut pilis, in quibus leges, aut alia publica monumenta incidebantur . . . . Παραπηγμα ἱϛορικον aut μυθικον dicitur series historiarum vel fabularum, secundum ordinem temporum digesta. Et hôc sensu planè accipiendum est in illis Diodori verbis †."

This learned commentator, if I rightly comprehend his idea, supposes parapegma to signify what we call a chronological table.

To these interpretations I shall subjoin the sentiments of Vossius.

"Diodorus Siculus solùm extendit [tempus μυθικον] usque ad bellum Trojanum; atque addit, ante ea tempora nihil certi haberi, propterea quòd nullum sit παραπηγμα περι τουτων πιϛευομενον. Nempe astrologi quidem habent tabulas suas, quæ παραπηγματα vocantur, ubi siderum ortus et occasus, atque tempestates, ordine annotantur; cujusmodi tabulas sequi tutò licet. At non historici similiter ante Trojana tempora, ut hic Diodorus ait, habent sua quoque παραπηγματα πιϛευομενα, ubi series temporum annotetur. Extabant quidem Arctinus, Eumelus, Lesches, alii poetæ cyclici; sed negat

* Newton's Chron. c. 1. Scal. ad Euseb. Chron. proleg. p. vi. Ejusdem Animad. p. 71. Marsham. Canon. Chron. p. 14. 329. edit. 1672. Stillingfl. Orig. Sacræ, b. i. c. 5, 6.

† Salmas. Plin. Exercit. p. 860.

hos παραπηγμα esse, cui sedem [fidem] habere semper possis, propter tot fabulas. Varro extendit μυθικον tempus ulterius; nimirum usque ad primam Olympiadem *."

If we understand the word parapegma of a chronological table, as Salmasius and Vossius explain it, such a table must consist of certain fixed periods or epochas; these epochas must be determined by canons or rules; and these canons or rules must be the basis, upon which a chronological system is founded. These different interpretations therefore seem to be, in fact, equivalent.

But in whatever sense we understand this term, the assertion of Diodorus is extremely unfavourable to the credit of the Parian Chronicle. For we must either suppose, that it was not EXISTING in the time of Diodorus, which at once decides the question; or, that Diodorus had not heard of it, which is scarcely credible, considering his abilities, and the pains he took to collect information from every quarter; or, lastly, that he did not think it πιςευομενον, worthy of credit; which will hardly be admitted by the advocates for the Arundelian Marbles.

The same inference may be drawn from the foregoing remarks of Africanus, Justin Martyr, Plutarch, Josephus, Varro, and Thucydides; for all these writers agree, that the earlier periods of the Grecian history were involved in darkness and confusion.

But, if the Parian chronologer could ascertain the dates of the most important events, which happened in Greece, five, six, seven, eight hundred years before the Olympiads; such as, the first establishment of the kingdom of Attica by Cecrops, the deluge in the time

* G. I. Vossii Chron. Sacræ Isagoge, c. 2. p. 7. edit. 1659.
De Parapegmate, vid. Vitruv. l. ix. 7. Gemini Isagog. c. 15. Usser. de Maced. Anno Solari, c. 6, 7. Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. ix. § 48.

of Deucalion, the coming of Danaus into Peloponnesus, the arrival of Cadmus in Bœotia, the siege of Troy, &c. with a particularity which we scarcely find in a modern history, there could be no want of light or information, no want of parapegmata, epochas, canons, or chronological tables: consequently, the complaints of all the writers above-mentioned, and many others, which might be alleged, are groundless and absurd.

This is a flagrant imputation on the knowledge, or the integrity, of those respectable authors; but it is obviated at once on a supposition, that the Parian Chronicle is a modern compilation.

Thucydides, I know, lived 140 years before the Chronicle is said to have been written; but if Thucydides, as well as other writers, complained, that there was nothing but uncertainty in the earlier periods of the Grecian history, from whence can we suppose the author of this inscription collected such a clear, determinate, and comprehensive system of chronology?

If he had any sources of information, which were unknown to succeeding writers, how happens it, that they should all of them overlook this most considerable, most exact, most creditable author? Why did they omit this ancient account of their early ages? Why did they not copy his most memorable epochas? Why did they not produce his authority? or, at least, why did they not mention his opinion? Surely nothing, to all appearance, could be more elaborate, more important, or of higher authority, than a chronological table, which was thought worthy of being engraved on marble!—Yet, on this occasion, as we shall soon find, all the writers of antiquity are perfectly silent!

CHAP. VII.

V. THE filence of the ancients, with refpect to the Parian Chronicle, is by no means a circumftance in its favour.

The learned and judicious Le Clerc, treating of the proper means of detecting fuppofititious books, among other rules for that purpofe, lays down the following aphorifm.

"Thofe writings, which are neither named in ancient catalogues, nor mentioned by any writer in the fame age, or in ages immediately following, are, for the moft part, to be accounted fictitious, or, at leaft, may be juftly fufpected *."

It is natural to fuppofe, that a fhort, infignificant infcription, like moft of thofe which are preferved in the collections of Gruter, Reinefius, Gudius, Spon, and others, might have lain expofed to public view for many ages, without being particularly noticed by hiftorians or antiquaries. But the Parian Chronicle is not a fmall infcription, of no importance in the republic of letters; it is not an infcription, which might have been concealed in a private library, or a cabinet, like a volume in manufcript. But it is a curious, learned, and comprehenfive fyftem of chronology, infcribed at a con-

* Scripta, quorum nulla mentio in prifcis catalogis, quæ nec memorata funt ab ullo fcriptore fequentium proximè fæculorum, ut plurimùm aut ficta judicanda funt, aut minimùm fufpecta habenda. Cler. Art. Crit. p. iii. § 2. c. 3.—In this paffage the author alludes to fuch catalogues as we find in Diogenes Laertius, or in A. Gellius. l. iii. 3.

fiderable

ſiderable expence on a tablet of marble, comprehending a detail of the principal epochas of Greece, during a period of 1300 years.

"In this inſcription," ſays Prideaux, "we have more events in the early ages of Greece, ſpecified and recorded, than are to be found in almoſt all the writers of antiquity *." The epochas of Cecrops, Deucalion, Hellen †, Cadmus, Danaus, Minos, Triptolemus, Heſiod, Homer, and others, about which the learned are ſtill in doubt, are here exactly aſcertained.

Here the queſtion, which has been a thouſand times debated, whether Homer or Heſiod is the more ancient author, is preciſely determined. Here likewiſe the year, the month, and the day of the month, in which Troy was taken, is particularly ſpecified.

Theſe are ſuch WONDERFUL DISCOVERIES in ancient hiſtory, that if this Chronicle had exiſted 264 years before the birth of Chriſt, and more eſpecially, if it had been compiled by PUBLIC AUTHORITY, or even KNOWN at Paros, it muſt have excited a general attention, and would certainly have been copied, or cited, or praiſed, or cenſured, or mentioned, by ſome writers of ſucceeding times.

But neither Strabo, Pliny, Pauſanias, nor Athenæus, who mention the moſt remarkable curioſities of different countries; neither Apollodorus, Diodorus Siculus, Tatian, Clemens Alexandrinus ‡, nor Euſebius,

* In uno horum, plura de antiquis Græcorum temporibus, quàm in omnibus ferè libris, habes explicata. Prid. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. v.

† From this Hellen the Greeks were called Hellenes. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. al. 6.

‡ Tatian cites fifteen, and Clemens Alexandrinus ten ancient writers, concerning a point of chronology, namely, the age of Homer, within the compaſs of two pages. Tatian. § 48. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 388.

who professedly treat of the fabulous ages of Greece, take the least notice of this wonderful monument of ancient learning. In short, we do not find in any writer of antiquity, either poet or historian, geographer or chronologer, mythologist or scholiast, the most distant allusion to the Parian Chronicle.

We have indeed lost the works of many ancient authors; yet perhaps there never appeared a writer of any reputation, either in Greece or Rome, in all the ages of classical antiquity, whose name, and some account of his writings, have not been transmitted to the present age. If this observation be not strictly true, the exceptions are few and inconsiderable.

It was such a common practice among the ancients, to mention the works of their predecessors, that in many books we find references and allusions to three, four, five, six, or seven hundred different authors of every denomination.

Above 170 authors are mentioned by Pausanias, 200 by A. Gellius, 320 by Servius, 340 by Diogenes Laertius, 350 in the Greek Scholia to Aristophanes, 430 by the two Senecas, 450 by Eustathius, 450 by Quintilian, 530 by Plutarch, 580 by Clemens Alexandrinus, 700 by Pliny, 700 by Athenæus, and a proportionable number by many other classic writers; but not a syllable of the learned Parian, or of his elaborate system of Grecian chronology.

At last, after it had existed above 1800 years, without being either named or cited, it is dug out of the ground, and brought to Europe in triumph; it is explained, quoted, applauded *, by critics and commentators. In a word, it is deposited in the bosom of our

* Vix aliud est in re literariâ, augustius, antiquius, utilius. Maittaire, Marm. Arund. dedic. p. i.

Alma

Alma Mater, and esteemed κτημα ες αει, "a glorious and everlasting acquisition."

Under these circumstances, it will be impossible to account for the profound silence of the ancients, and their gross inattention to a writer, who now excites the curiosity and admiration of the literary world, and professes to unravel all the chronological perplexities of the fabulous and heroic ages of Greece.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

THERE are three objections, which may be alleged against the preceding argument.

First, as there were many chronological writers among the Greeks, the author of the Parian Chronicle might have been one of them, and cited under his proper name, without any reference to the inscription.

Secondly, this Chronicle has been ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus.

Thirdly, the works of some eminent writers of antiquity, such as Phædrus and Q. Curtius, lay in obscurity for many centuries, and were not discovered till later ages.

The supposition, on which the first of these objections is founded, is extremely improbable. The ancients almost always specified the works of their predecessors, which they had occasion to quote. Thus, Diogenes Laertius refers to Demetrius Phalereus, *εν τῃ των Αρχοντων Αναγραφῃ*; to Apollodorus, *εν Χρονικοις*; to Eratosthenes, *εν τοις Ολυμπιονικαις*; to Timæus, *εν δεκατῃ Ἱστοριων*, &c.

In the same manner, the Parian Chronicle would certainly have been mentioned under some distinguishing title, if it had been noticed or cited by the writers of antiquity.

But let us enquire, how far the chronology of the learned Parian corresponds with that of the ancients, in two or three instances of the utmost notoriety, the epocha of the Trojan war, and the age of Homer.

The

The EPOCHA of the TROJAN WAR.

	Bef. Chr.
Sosibius reckoned, from the destruction of Troy to the first Olympiad, 395 years *. -	1171
Eratosthenes computed, from the taking of Troy to the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years; from thence to the colonization of Ionia, 60 years; from thence to the tutelary government of Lycurgus, 159 years; and from thence to the commencement of the Olympiads, 108 years; in all 407 †. - -	1183
Dionysius Argivus supposed, that Troy was taken in the eighteenth year of the reign of Agamemnon, and the first of Demophon ‡. - - - -	1183
P. Cato placed the building of Rome, in the first year of the seventh Olympiad, 432	

* Apud Censorin. c. 21.—The passage in Censorinus, on which some of the following computations depend, is confused and erroneous. The Cambridge edition in 1695, and Havercamp's in 1767, give it in this manner:

Secundum [tempus] non planè quidem scitur; sed tamen ad mille circiter et IↃC annos esse creditur: à priore scilicet cataclysmo, quem Ogygium dicunt, *ad Inachi regnum*, anni circiter CCCC: hinc ad Olympiadem primam paulo plus CCCC . . . Et quidem Sosibius scripsit esse CCCXCV, &c.

The following alteration will perhaps give us a clear and consistent idea of the author's calculations.——Sed tamen ad *mille* circiter annos esse creditur à priore scilicet cataclysmo, quem Ogygium dicunt, *ad Ilii excidium*, anni circiter IↃC. Hinc ad Olympiadem primam paulo plus CCCC, &c. See Jackson's Chron. Antiq. vol. iii. p. 330.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.—Eratosthenes autem septem et CCCC. Censor. loc. cit.

‡ Clem Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 381. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 376. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 12. p. 498.

Q years

Bef. Chr.

years after the Trojan war *. From this number deduct 25 years for the Olympiads, preceding the foundation of the city, and the remainder will be 407. - - 1183

Dionysius of Halicarnassus follows the computation of Cato. - - - 1183

Diodorus Siculus computes 779 years, from the taking of Troy to the end of the ninety-third Olympiad †; and consequently, to the first Olympiad, 407 years. - - 1183

Tatian places the Trojan war 407 years before the Olympiads ‡. - - - 1183

Eusebius tells us, that from the taking of Troy to the first Olympiad, there were 406 years; or, according to Scaliger, 407 ‖. - - - - 1183

Apollodorus reckoned, from the Trojan war to the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years; and from thence to the first Olympiad, 328 years §. - - - 1184

Solinus places the restoration of the Olympic games, in the four hundred and eighth year after the destruction of Troy ¶. 1184

The Greek chronologists, as Eusebius informs us, computed 408 years from the siege of Troy to the first Olympiad **. - 1184

Censorinus reckons, from the destruction

* Dion. Halic. l. i. p. 60.
† Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 235.
‡ Tatian. ad Græc. § 64.
‖ Euseb. Chron. p. 93. Scal. Animadv. p. 53.
§ Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 5, 6.
¶ Solin. c. 1. § 28. edit. Goezii, 1777.
** Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 9. p. 484.

of

	Bef. Chr.
of Troy to the first Olympiad, a little more than 400 years *. - - -	118*
Aretes Dyrrhachinus makes this interval 414 years †. - - -	1190
Paterculus reckons 437 years from the taking of Troy to the building of Rome, 22 years after the commencement of the Olympiads ‡. - - -	1191
Timæus computed, from the destruction of Troy to the first Olympiad, 417 years ‖.	1193
Dicæarchus reckoned, from the reign of Nilus to the first Olympiad, 436 years §.—By the reign of Nilus, Sir John Marsham says, Dicæarchus indicates the time of the Trojan war. - - -	1212
The author of the Life of Homer, ascribed to Herodotus, reckons, from the Trojan war to the birth of that poet, 168 years; from thence to the expedition of Xerxes into Greece in 480, 622 years ¶. - -	1270
Duris Samius, who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, computed from the destruction of Troy to Alexander's expedi-	

* Censor. loc. cit.—This calculation depends on the correction proposed in a former note.

† Apud Censorin. loc. cit.—In the Cambridge edition, and that of Havercamp, &c. the number is IↃXIIII; but this seems to be a mistake instead of CDXIIII.

‡ V. Paterc. l. i. c. 8.—There is probably an error in the text of Paterculus.

‖ Apud Censorin. loc. cit.

§ Apud Schol. in Apoll. Argon. l. iv. v. 276. p. 412. edit. 1641.—Per regnum Nili belli Trojani tempora Dicæarchus designat. Marsh. Can. Chron. sec. x. p. 249.—Dicæarchus was one of Aristotle's disciples.

¶ Vita Homeri inter Herod. Op. § 38.

 tion

tion into Asia, in the year bef. Chr. 335, 1000 years *. - - -	Bef. Chr. 1335
The Parian Chronicle places the destruction of Troy before the Olympic æra, 433 years. - - -	1209

Several writers acquaint us with the month, and the day of the month, on which Troy was taken. Some placed this event on the twenty-third day of Scirrophorion †; Ægias or Agis, and Dercylus, on the twenty-third of Panemus ‡; Hellanicus and Dionysius Argivus on the twelfth of Thargelion ‖; Dionysius Halicarnasseus, an ancient scholiast on Euripides, and others, on the twenty-third of that month §; Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damastes, and Philarchus, on the twenty-fourth ¶. The

* Apud. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 381. Vid. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 376.

‡ Clem. Alex. loc. cit.——According to Corsini, Panemus, among the Corinthians, coincided with Hecatombæon or July; and among the Macedonians, with Scirrophorion or June. Corsini Differt. Agonist. p. 159. Fast. Attic. Differt. iii. § 20, 21.

‖ Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

§ Ογδοη φθινοντος μηνος Θαργηλιωνος, octavâ desinentis Thargelionis die; that is, the eighth from the end, or the twenty-third day of the month. Dionys. Halic. l. i. p. 51. Schol. ad Eurip. Hecub. v. 914. apud Scal. Emend. Temp. l. v. p. 378. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

¶ Τη εβδομη φθινοντος, septimâ desinentis die, or the twenty-fourth. Plut. in v. Camilli. p. 138.

Before the first year of the LXXXVII Olympiad, that is, bef. Chr. 432, the Athenians, according to Corsini, began their year from the winter solstice, with the month Gamelion; afterwards from the summer solstice, with Hecatombæon. Their year had twelve months, consisting of 30 and 29 days alternately. This learned writer ranges them in the following order: Hecatombæon, Metagitnion, Boëdromion, Pyanepsion, Mæmacterion, Posideon, Gamelion,

The Parian Chronicle likewise places it on the twenty-fourth of Thargelion.

With respect to the sentiments of modern chronologers, concerning the time of this event, it may be sufficient to observe, that there are two opinions, transmitted to us by the ancients, which nearly coincide, and carry with them the greatest probability. The one is adopted by Scaliger *, and his followers, Calvisius, Emmius, &c. who place it in the year bef. Chr. 1183; the other, by Petavius, Capellus, Usher, Strauchius, &c. who place it in 1184.

Some of the Greek writers, as we have already observed, have asserted, that Troy was taken on the twenty-third, and others, on the twenty-fourth of Thargelion. In order to adjust this dispute, modern chronologists have supposed, that the city was taken in the night, between the twenty-third and the twenty-fourth †. But this, I apprehend, is rather an imaginary, than a real exactness.

lion, Anthesterion, Elaphebolion, Munychion, Thargelion, Scirrophorion, which nearly corresponded with July, August, September, October, &c. Corsini Differt. Agonist. p. 159 Fast. Attic. Differt. ii. § 8. 22. 29. &c. Id. tom. iii. Proleg. p. xxviii.

* Emend. Temp. l. v. p. 379. Canon. Isag. l. iii. p. 289.

† Capellus colligit Ιλιου ἁλωσιν contigisse inter Junii decimum tertium, et decimum quartum; nocte scilicet, quæ media fuit inter lunam 23 et 24, hoc est, inter ἑβδομην φθινοντος et ογδοην φθινοντος Thargelionis. Simsonii Chron. p. 330.

Facilè dissidium illud componi poterit, sive quòd nox illa, quâ urbs incensa ac direpta fuit, tum ad vigesimam tertiam, quæ præcesserat, tum ad vigesimam quartam proximè insequentem diem referri possit; sive quòd in Thargelione mense dies aliqua, juxtà Metonis leges, exempta concipiatur; adeóque una eademque dies, quæ verè vigesima tertia fuerat, atque ογδοη φθινοντος, à Dionysio, et Clemente quoque Alexandrino vocata fuit, vigesima quarta ab aliis appellari potuerit, si exemptilis ipsa in dierum numero computetur. Corsini Fast. Attic. Differt. ii. p. 86.

Let us now see, how the hypothesis of the Parian Chronicle corresponds with the sentiments of the foregoing writers, in this and other articles.

Eratosthenes, Dionysius Argivus, Cato, Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Diodorus, Tatian, and Eusebius, make an interval, between the Trojan war and the Olympiads, of 407 years; other authors, an interval of 408.

The compiler of the Parian Chronicle makes the same interval consist of 433 years; in which he differs from the former 26, and from the latter 25 years.

He supposes, that Troy was taken 1209 years before the Christian æra, on the twenty-fourth day of Thargelion; and, in this particular, he agrees with Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damastes, and Philarchus. But Plutarch, who gives us the sentiments of these writers, does not mention the year, in which they placed that event.

The learned Petavius, having examined the circumstances, recorded by the ancients, relative to the year, the month, and the day, on which Troy was taken; and compared those circumstances with the lunations, by which the Grecian months were regulated, observes, that every thing coincides with the year of the Julian period 3530, bef. Chr. 1184; but that the Arundelian marbles, which place that event on the twenty-fourth day of Thargelion, in the year of the J. P. 3505, or bef. Chr. 1209, totally confound all the accounts of the ancients *.

Isocrates reckoned, that the Athenian constitution

* Igitur anno Per. Jul. 3530, ante Christianam æram 1184, nobilissimum illud excidium incidit. Marmora Arundelliana idem eo anno vindicant, qui fit Per. Jul. 3505, Thargelionis ἑβδόμῃ φθίνοντος, hoc est, 24 die: quod antiquorum omnium rationes CONTURBAT. Ration. Temp. par. ii. l. ii. c. 10. Ibid. p. i. l. i. c. 12.

had

had fubfifted from its firft eftablifhment by Cecrops, to the ufurpation of Pififtratus, ουκ ελαττον χιλιων ετων, not lefs than a thoufand years *. The Chronicle makes this period 1021 years.

It is obferved by Selden, that the beginning of the reign of Cecrops is placed 26 years fooner by the author of the Chronicle, than it is by Eufebius †; and that there is very feldom any greater agreement between them, before the appointment of the annual archons. It may not therefore be improper to illuftrate this obfervation by a few examples.

The difference between the Parian Chronicle and Eufebius, in the date of fome memorable occurrences.

	P. C.	Euf.	Diff.
Cecrops began to reign in Attica, bef. Chr. - - -	1582	1556	26
Deucalion began to reign at Lycoria - - -	1574	1541	33
Deucalion's deluge - -	1529	1527	2
Cadmus builds Cadmea - -	1519	1455	64
Danaus arrives in Greece - -	1511	1474	37
Erichthonius celebrates the Panathenæa - - -	1506	1474	32
Thefeus reforms the government of Athens - - -	1259	1233	26
The Nemean games inftituted -	1251	1232	19
Mneftheus began to reign at Athens	1230	1204	26
Troy taken - - -	1209	1183	26

* Orat. Panath. p. 409. edit. Cantab. 1686.—Ifocrates was born 436 years, and wrote his Panathenaic oration 343 years, before Chrift.

† Epocha hæc recentior eft Eufebio, annis XXVI. Nec minor firmè confenfus eft inter eum et noftrum, ante annuorum archontum initia, feu Periodi Julianæ annum 4030. Seld. Marm. Arund. p. 92.

Phædon

	P. C.	Euf.	Diff.
Phædon invents weights and meafures - - -	895	800	95
Creon made annual archon - -	684	684	—
Terpander - - -	645	646	1
Cyrus takes Sardes - -	542	549	7
Battle at Marathon - -	491	491	—
Sea-fight at Salamis - -	481	480	1
Gelo feizes the kingdom of Syracufe,	479	487	8

Thus far we do not find any exact and uniform correfpondence, between the Parian Chronicle and any writer of antiquity, with which we are acquainted.

CHAP

CHAP. IX.

The Age of Homer.

The Age of Homer.	Bef. Chr.
THEOPOMPUS conceived, that Homer lived 500 years after the warriors, who were present at the siege of Troy. Others, mentioned by Tatian, were of the same opinion *. - - -	684
Euphorion imagined, that Homer lived in the time of Gyges, who, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, began to reign in the eighteenth Olympiad †. - -	708
Some writers, mentioned by Eusebius, place him 400 years after the destruction of Troy ‡. - - - -	784
Sosibius made Homer flourish 90 years before the Olympiads ‖. - -	866
Euphorbus, or Ephorus, 124 years before the building of Rome §. - -	877
Herodotus was of opinion, that Hesiod and Homer did not live above 400 years before his time ¶.—Herodotus was born bef. Chr. 484. - - -	884
Porphyry, and the generality of writers, as Suidas informs us, made Homer a hun-	

* Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 389. Tatian. § 49.
† Tatian. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.
‡ Euseb. Chron. p. 97.
‖ Tatian. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.
§ Euseb. Chron. p. 106.
¶ Herod. l. ii. § 53.

	Bef. Chr.
dred years older than Hesiod, and supposed Hesiod to flourish only 32 years before the Olympiads *. - - -	908
Cornelius Nepos, in his Chronica, placed Homer 160 years before the building of Rome †. - - - -	912
Solinus imagines he lived 138 years before the Olympiads ‡. - - -	914
Eusebius places Homer, according to the opinion of some writers, 140 years before the first Olympiad ‖. - - -	916
Velleius Paterculus says, Homer flourished 950 years before his time. He wrote his history about 30 years after the Christian æra; Homer therefore, by his reckoning, flourished bef. Chr. 920 years §. -	920
Pliny, about the year 78, reckons, that Homer lived near 1000 years before him ¶.	920
Juvenal, about the year 98, likewise supposes, that Homer's poems had been extant a thousand years **. - - -	902
Apollodorus supposed, that Homer lived 100 years after the Ionic migration, and 240 after the Trojan war ††. - -	944

* Suidas in v. Ἡσιοδος.

† Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.

‡ Solin. c. 40. § 17.

‖ Euseb. Chron. num. 1101. p. 106.

§ Nam fermè ante annos nongentos quinquaginta floruit. Paterc. l. i. c. 5.

¶ Jam ante annos prope mille Homerus. Plin. l. vii. c. 16.

** ———Uni cedit Homero,
Propter mille annos. Sat. vii. 38.

†† Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit. Eusebius says, Apollodorus placed Homer 260 years after the destruction of Troy. Chron. p. 97.

Euthymenes

	Bef. Chr.
Euthymenes asserted, that Homer was born in Chios, about 200 years after the taking of Troy, and that Hesiod was his contemporary *. - - -	984
Archemachus was of the same opinion. -	984
Philochorus maintained, that Homer was born 180 years after the destruction of Troy †. - - - -	1003
Cassius Hemina asserted, that Homer and Hesiod lived a little more than 160 years after the Trojan war ‡. - -	1023
Aristarchus thought, that Homer lived at the time of the Ionic migration, which, according to Tatian and Clemens, was 140 years after the destruction of Troy ‖. -	1044
Eratosthenes placed την ἡλικιαν, the age of Homer, 100 years after the Trojan war §. -	1083
The author of the life of Homer, ascribed to Herodotus, asserts, that Homer was born 622 years before the expedition of Xerxes into Greece, which was in 480 ¶. -	1102

* Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit.

† Tatian. loc. cit. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 388. Euseb. Chron. 97.

‡ Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21. Euseb. Chron. p. 101.

‖ Tatian. § 49. Clem. Alex. loc. cit. Euseb. Chron. p. 97. Homeri Vita, inter Opusc. Mythol. à Galeo edita.

§ Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit. Euseb. Chron. p. 100. Syncell. p. 180.—Ἡλικια, in Clemens Alexandrinus, means the flourishing age, or the age of manhood.

¶ Vita Homeri, § 38.—In this passage, there is a difference of above 200 years between the computation of Homer's biographer, and that of Herodotus. This, among other circumstances, is an argument, that Herodotus was not the author of the Life of Homer. Scaliger imagines, that ἑξακοσια, 600, should be τετρακοσια, 400. Scalig. Animadv. in Euseb. num. 1548. p. 102.

	Bef. Chr.
Crates Mallotes supposed, that Homer flourished just before, or about, the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years after the Trojan war *. - - - - -	1104
Some writers, mentioned by Eusebius, place Homer 333 years before the Olympiads †. - - - - -	1109
Some, says Plutarch, affirm, that Homer lived at the time of the Trojan war, and	1184
was an eye-witness of it; others, that he lived 100 years after it ‡. - -	1084
The author of the PARIAN CHRONICLE tells us, that Homer flourished 302 years after the Trojan war, 37 years after Hesiod, 23 before the restoration of the Olympiads by Iphitus and Lycurgus in the year 884; and 131 before their final establishment, when Corœbus was victor in the race, in 776. -	907

Hesiod is supposed to have been older than Homer by Aristophanes, [Ephorus], Accius ‖, &c.

Homer

* Προ της καθοδου. Tatian. § 49. Euseb. Chron. num. 908. p. 97. Homeri Vita supra cit. Περι την καθοδον. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 389.

† Homerus secundum quorundam opinionem his fuisse temporibus judicatur. Euseb. Chron. loc. cit.

‡ Plut. in v. Homeri, p. 44.—The word used by Plutarch is γινεσθαι, esse, to live.

‖ Aristoph. Ran. v. 1065.—This testimony is of little weight, as it entirely depends on the order of the words, or the position of the two names, Hesiod and Homer.

Alii minorem fuisse Homerum; in quîs L. Accius poeta, et Ephorus historiæ scriptor. Ephor. apud A. Gell. l. iii. c. 11. L. Accius, ibid.—The argument, on which Accius founded his opinion, is extremely frivolous. Homer, he thinks, would have told

Homer and Hesiod are said to have been contemporaries by Herodotus, Ephorus, Euthymenes, Varro, Plutarch, Philostratus, Cyril,* &c.

Homer is supposed to have lived some time before Hesiod by Philochorus, Xenophanes, Cicero, Paterculus, Josephus, Pliny, A. Gellius, Solinus, Porphyry, Eustathius, and almost all other writers †.

From

told his readers who Peleus was; and would likewise have said, that Polyphemus had but one eye, if Hesiod had not mentioned these things before him.

* Herod. l. ii. § 53.

Ephorus apud Syncell. p. 173.—Ephorus asserted, that Hesiod was the kinsman and contemporary of Homer. In the edition of Goarus the words are, Ἡσιοδος εγνωριζετο, ὃν Εφορος ανεψιον και συγχρονον ἑμου φησιν; and translated, Hesiodus florebat, quem Ephorus nepotem et sibi coëvum celebrat. But this is absurd. The true reading is certainly συγχρονον Ὁμηρου φησιν.

Euthemenes apud Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

Varro apud A. Gell. loc. cit. Varr. Fragm. p. 78.

Plutarch. de Consol. p. 105. Sympos. l. v. quæst. 2. p. 675. Sept. Sapient. Conv. p. 153.

Philost. Ἡρωικα, in Euphorbo.

Cyril. adv. Jul. l. i. p. 11.

† Philochorus, Xenophanes.—Alii Homerum quàm Hesiodum majorem natu fuisse scripserunt, in quîs Philochorus & Xenophanes. A. Gell. l. iii. c. 11.

Cicero.—Homerus multis, ut mihi videtur, ante [Hesiodum] seculis fuit. De Senect. § 15.

Josephus.—Ὁλως δε παρα τοις Ἑλλησιν ουδεν ὁμολογουμενον ευρισκεται γραμμα, της Ὁμηρου ποιησεως πρεσβυτερον, Neque tu scriptum omnino apud Græcos ullum, cujus de fide modò constet, Homeri poësi antiquius invenias. Cont. Ap. l. i. § 2.

Paterculus.—Hesiodus fuit circa cxx annos distinctus ab Homeri ætate. l. i. c. 7.

Pliny.—Homerus quidem primus doctrinarum et antiquitatis parens. Nat. Hist. l. xxv. c. 2.

A. Gellius.—De Homero et Hesiodo inter omnes ferè scriptores

From this enquiry, concerning the age of Homer, we may deduce the following observations.

First, that there is a variation in the conjectures of the ancients, of 500 years in this article.

Secondly, that such a diversity of sentiments, respecting the age of this illustrious poet, is a farther proof of what has been already advanced, that the Greeks had no regular history or chronology before the Olympiads.

Thirdly, that the computation on the Arundelian Marble, relative to the age of Homer, does not agree with the opinion of the principal chronologers of antiquity. It differs from the computation of Apollodorus 62 years, and from that of Eratosthenes 202, in the interval between the siege of Troy and time of Homer; and from others, in a greater or less proportion; though it must be acknowledged, that we cannot form any precise idea of this diversity; since few of these writers inform us, whether they speak of the birth, the ἠλικια, or the death of Homer.

Fourthly, that the opinion, adopted by the author of the Chronicle, which supposes Hesiod to be older than Homer, is not well supported; nor is it the most commonly received opinion. Suidas informs us, that οἱ πλειςοι, the generality of writers, supposed Hesiod to have been 100 years younger than Homer *. According to

tores constitit, ætatem eos egisse vel iisdem ferè temporibus, vel Homerum aliquanto antiquiorem. Noct. Attic. l. xvii. c. 21.

Solinus.—Inter quem [Homerum] et Hesiodem poetam, qui in auspiciis Olympiadis primæ obiit, centum triginta octo anni medii fuerunt. c. 40. § 17.

Porphyry.—Πορφυριος, και αλλοι πλειςοι, νεωτερον εκατον ενιαυτοις ορι-ζουσιν, Porphyrius, et alii plurimi, ipsum Homero juniorem centum annis statuunt. Suid. in v. Ἡσιοδος.

Eustathius.—Apud Hom. Odys. l. iv. p. 187.

* Suidas, loc. cit.

A. Gellius, "almoſt all writers agreed, that Homer and Heſiod were either nearly contemporaries; or, that Homer was a little more ancient *." It is likewiſe atteſted by Joſephus, Sextus, Empiricus †, and others, that there was no writing remaining among the Greeks, more ancient than the poems of Homer. This then was the general voice of antiquity.

Laſtly, that in all this controverſy, ſo frequently and ſo warmly debated, both in Greece and Italy, we do not find the leaſt reference or alluſion to the Chronicle of Paros; nor any one author of antiquity, to which this Chronicle can be fairly attributed.

But let us conſider the ſecond objection.

* De Homero & Heſiodo inter *omnes* ferè ſcriptores conſtitit, ætatem eos egiſſe, vel iiſdem ferè temporibus, vel Homerum aliquantò antiquiorem. A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.

† Joſ. loc. cit.—Ποιημα ουδεν πρεσβυτερον ηκεν εις ἡμας της Ὁμηρου ποιησεως. Sext. Empir. adv. Mathemat. p. 41.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

THE author of four Diſſertations, ſubjoined to the book of Daniel ſecundum Septuaginta, printed at Rome in 1772, aſcribes the Parian Chronicle to Demetrius Phalereus *.

This writer adopts the ſtory, related by Ariſteas, concerning the tranſlation of the Jewiſh ſcriptures into Greek; and conſequently maintains, that Demetrius Phalereus was principally concerned in recommending and promoting that verſion. But as it is ſuppoſed to have been made in the eighth year of Ptolemy Philadelphus †; 277 years before the Chriſtian æra, after the death

* ΔΑΝΙΗΛ κατα τους ἑβδομηκοντα, εκ των Τετραπλων Ωριγενους. Daniel ſecundum LXX. ex Tetraplis Originis, nunc primùm editus è ſingulari Chiſiano codice, annorum ſupra IↃCCC. Romæ 1772. folio.

† "Within the compaſs of this year archbiſhop Uſher places the making of this tranſlation. And here all muſt place it, who with him BELIEVE the hiſtory to be GENUINE, which is written of it under the name of Ariſteas, and will hold what is conſiſtent with it herein. For, according to that author, they cannot place it later; becauſe then it would not fall within the time of Eleazar, who is therein ſaid to have been the high-prieſt of the Jews, that ſent the ſeventy-two elders to Alexandria to make this tranſlation; for he died about the beginning of the next year. And they cannot place it ſooner; becauſe then it would be before Ptolemy Philadelphus married Arſinoe, his ſiſter, whom Eleazar, in the epiſtle, which the author makes him to have written to this prince, calls his queen and his ſiſter." Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 38. Vid. Ariſteæ Hiſt. edit. Oxon. p. 17.

The learned Dr. Hody is of opinion, that the Pentateuch only was tranſlated into Greek, about the year 285, when Ptolemy Philadelphus

death of Demetrius, our author endeavours to remove this chronological objection, by proving, that Demetrius was not only alive at that time, but that he afterwards composed a history of the Jews, and the Parian Chronicle *.

I shall briefly consider his arguments and observations relative to the Chronicle.

"This performance," he observes, "is evidently the work of one person †."

Granted.

"The author has paid more attention to poets, and the history of literature, than to warriors or military transactions; of which we have instances in the fiftieth and sixty-fifth epochas, where he speaks of Simonides and Sophocles ‡."

Admitting the truth of this remark, it will only prove, that the writer was a poet, or a man of letters; which no person will controvert.

"It is well known," says the learned editor of Daniel, "that Demetrius Phalereus was the author of a work, entitled, των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη, which was esteemed by the ancients, and is cited by Diogenes Laertius, in order to ascertain the date of some events in the lives of

ladelphus was king of Egypt, in partnership with his father; and that this version was not made by royal authority, but by the Jews of Alexandria, for the use of the synagogue. De Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

* Dr. Chandler seems to have acquiesced in this opinion; for he says: "This Demetrius was author of the ancient and famous Chronicon, inscribed on marble at Paros, and now preserved, but not entire, at Oxford. See Daniel à LXX. p. 480. Rome, 1772." Chandler's Travels in Greece, c. vii.

† Auctor certè unus fuit. Differt. iv. § 21.

‡ Poetarum potius mentionem ingerit, indéque literarum historiam prosequitur. Ibid.

Thales and Anaxagoras. From which it appears, that his performance was not a mere list of names; but included many historical events, such as we find in the Parian Chronicle *."

From this very slight and equivocal resemblance between the plan of the Αναγραφη, and that of the Chronicle, we can by no means infer, that they were the productions of the same writer.

For, 1. the Chronicle takes no notice of Thales or Anaxagoras, or of the circumstances, for which the Αναγραφη is quoted by Laertius. Yet we might have expected to find a perfect coincidence in these articles, if the one had been a copy of the other.

2. Demetrius, as Plutarch informs us, asserted, that Aristides was archon after the battle at Platææ, a little before his death †, which happened in the year 467. But nothing of this kind is to be found in the Chronicle.

3. From Creon to Diotimus inclusive, there were 330 annual archons; but allowing one for each epocha, not more than forty-seven were originally mentioned in the Chronicle, within that period. The Chronicle therefore cannot, in any sense of the word, be styled, των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη, a catalogue of the archons.

There is a dispute among the ancients concerning the age of Socrates. Some say, that he lived sixty, others seventy years. The Parian Chronicle asserts, that he died at the age of seventy, when Laches was archon at Athens.

This, our author observes, is likewise asserted by Demetrius Phalereus. For, says Diogenes Laertius,

* In Marmore Arundelliano nihil occurrit, quod non conveniat Demetrio. Ibid. p. 481.

† Plut. in v. Arist. p. 321.

"Socrates

"Socrates died in the first year of the ninety-fifth Olympiad, when he was seventy years of age. Demetrius Phalereus says the same *. Others tell us, that he died at the age of sixty."

I answer: fifty writers might say this, as well as Demetrius Phalereus; for Plato, fourscore years before, had made Socrates tell the Athenians, in his Apology, that he was above seventy years of age, when he was brought to his trial †.

2. It does not appear, that Laertius took this account of the age of Socrates from the Αναγραφη of Demetrius. He most probably found it in another work by the same author, entitled, SOCRATES, which is mentioned in the list of his writings, and quoted by Plutarch in his Life of Aristides ‡.

3. This coincidence does not, by any means, prove, that the Chronicle was composed by Demetrius; because a modern author would naturally take his account of the age of Socrates, either from Plato or Laertius.

Laertius, in his catalogue of the writings of Demetrius, takes no notice of his Αναγραφη, or however does not mention it under this title.

The author of the Dissertation imagines, that "his account of the archons might be included in his two books Περι των Αθηνησι πολιτων, Of the Citizens of Athens,

* Και ταυτα φησι και Δημητριος ὁ Φαληρευς, eadem fermè Demetrius Phalereus. Diog. Laert. in v. Demet. l. v. § 44.

† Ετη γεγονως πλειω ἑβδομηκοντα, plures quàm septuaginta annos natus. Apol. Socrat. § 1. Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 266.

Socrates was born in the year bef. Chr. 469, and died in 400. Corsin. Fasti Attici. tom. iii. p. 189. 281.

‡ Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius mention a book, written by Demetrius Phalereus, entitled, SOCRATES. Plut. in v. Aristid. § 1. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 81. Diogenes likewise quotes a work by Demetrius, which is probably the same performance, entitled, Socratis Apologia, l. ix. § 15. § 37. Vid. Athen. l. xiii. § 1.

 which

which is mentioned by Laertius; and this," he thinks, "will be very probable, if, instead of πολιτων, citizens, we read πολιτευσαντων, governors or magistrates."

As this correction of the text is unsupported by any authority, it is of no weight in the argument. The omission of the Αναγραφη, in the Catalogue given by Laertius, would lead us to suspect, that it was a performance of no great consequence.

If it had been either the Chronicle itself, or the original, from which the Chronicle was taken, it would have been accounted a work of importance to the general history of Greece, and have been much oftener quoted than it is. At present, we have only two or three general references in Laertius to certain passages in it, which do NOT EXIST in the Chronicle.

At the beginning of the Chronicle, we find the following remaining characters, which no commentator has attempted to explain.

. . . . . . ου . . . . υπαυ . . . . ων . . . . .
. . . . . των ανεγραψα τους, κ. τ. λ.

Our author fills up these lacunæ in this manner.

Δημητριος ὁ ΦανοϛρατΟΥ Φαληρευς, εκ των συΜΠΑΝτων ὑπαρχονΤΩΝ, ἀνεγραψα τους, κ. τ. λ. Demetrius Phanostrati filius Phalereus, ex omnibus quæ extant monumentis edidi, &c.

This is an ingenious supplement; but it does not coincide with ALL the remaining letters; and any other names will suit the place, as well as those of Demetrius Phalereus and Phanostratus, provided the name of the father, in the genitive case, ends in ΟΥ.

Our author observes, that Demetrius, in his computation of time, uses an expression, which is constantly employed in the Parian Chronicle: namely, ἀφ' ὁυ, ex quo.

Αφ'

Αφ' ὁυ δε αἱ φυλαι αἱ δεκα, ex quo autem decem tribus. Αφ' ὁυ δε εξ Ἱεροσολυμων, ex quo autem ex Hierosolymis *. Αφ' ὁυ δε εκλεγηναι Αβρααμ, ex quo selectus est Abrahamus. Αφ' ὁυ δε ἐκ Χανααν αυτον ελθειν εις Αιγυπτον, ex quo venit è terrâ Chananæâ in Ægyptum †."

In answer to this argument we may remark, that αφ' ὁυ is a common phrase; and that no inference can be drawn from it. For instance;

Αφ' ὁυ ὁ κυριος εγεννηθη, ex quo natus est Dominus. Αφ' ὁυ δε επαθεν, ex quo autem passus est. Αφ' ὁυ εστη το βδελυγμα ὑπο Νερωνος, ex quo stetit abominatio à Nerone ‡.

Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius have indeed quoted a writer called Demetrius, in which the foregoing passages occur. But he must have an uncommon share of credulity, who can believe, that the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus wrote a history of the JEWS! The first passage above cited, if taken from Demetrius, seems to contain a refutation of this opinion; for the time is there computed from the captivity of the ten tribes, to the FOURTH Ptolemy ‖, or Ptolemy Philopator, who did not begin his reign till the year before Christ 222, a long time after the death of Demetrius Phalereus §.

It

* Demetrius apud Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

† Id. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. ix. c. 21. p. 425.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 407, 408. Vid. African. apud Eufeb. Chron. p. 47.

‖ Αφ' ὁυ δε αἱ φυλαι αἱ δεκα εκ Σαμαρειας αιχμαλωτοι γεγονασιν, ἑως Πτολεμαιου τεταρτου, ετη πεντακοσια ἑβδομηκοντα τρια, μηνας εννεα. Ex quo autem decem tribus abductæ fuerunt captivæ ex Samariâ, usque ad Ptolemæum quartum, anni DLXXIII, novem menses. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

§ In order to remove this objection, the author translates ἑως Πτολεμαιου τεταρτου, ετη πεντακοσια ἑβδομηκοντα τρια, not as the words

are

It has been obſerved, that Joſephus * ſpeaks of Demetrius Phalereus, as a writer of the Jewiſh hiſtory.

Huetius thinks, that Joſephus, in this caſe, has confounded Demetrius Phalereus, with Demetrius Judæus, who wrote an account of the Jewiſh kings †.

Jonſius ſuppoſes, that in the paſſage, where Demetrius is mentioned by Joſephus, the word *Phalereus* has been inſerted by ſome officious interpreter; or that there was a younger writer called Demetrius Phalereus ‡.

But

are uſually rendered, uſque ad Ptolemæum quartum; but, uſque ad Ptolemæi quartum annum, anni DLXXIII.

If, ſays he, Demetrius had meant the *fourth* Ptolemy, he would have expreſſed himſelf thus: ἑως Πτολεμαιου ΤΟΥ τεταρτου.—But this is by no means a conſequence. On ſimilar occaſions, the numeral adjective is uſed by various authors, without the prepoſitive article. Thus Joannes Malala: εβασιλευσε τριτος Πτολεμαιος—εβασιλευσε τεταρτος Πτολεμαιος—δωδεκατος δε Πτολεμαιος, &c. Malalæ Chronog. l. viii. p. 250.—Και γαρ τριτος Πτολεμαιος. Joſ. cont. Ap. l. ii. § 5.

* Cont. Ap. l. i. § 23. See alſo Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 404.

† Huet. Demonſt. Evang. prop. iv. c. 2. § 20.

‡ Demetrium quendam de Judæorum regibus ſcripſiſſe credo Clementi. Phalereum ejus libri auctorem eſſe Joſepho non credo; ſed gloſſematis loco habendam eſſe vocem *Phalereus* adſerere malim; vel junior fuerit Demetrius Phalereus, et à priore diverſus. Jonſius, de Script. Hiſt. Phil. l. i. c. 18. § 4.

Jerom ſpeaks of this Demetrius as a Jew. Clemens Alexandrinus, he ſays, DE JUDÆIS Ariſtobulum quendam, et Demetrium, et Eupolemum, ſcriptores ADVERSUS GENTES refert, qui in ſimilitudinem Joſephi Αρχαιογονιας Moyſis & Judaicæ gentis aſſeverant. De Script. Eccl. tom. i. p. 281.

This Demetrius, ſays Prideaux, was an hiſtorian, that wrote in Greek, and an inhabitant of Alexandria, where he compiled a hiſtory of the Jews, and continued it down to the reign of the fourth Ptolemy, who was Ptolemy Philopator, the grandſon of Philadelphus.

But I can scarce think, that *Phalereus* is an interpolation; because Tertullian and Eusebius, who have quoted Josephus, call the Jewish historian Demetrius Phalereus *.

I rather believe, there was some counterfeit history of the Jews, in circulation, under the name of this eminent philosopher.

Fabricius is of this opinion: Demetrium intellige Judæum quendam, qui scripserat librum de Regibus Judæorum, sub nomine fortassis Demetrii Phalerei †.

It is allowed on all hands, that Demetrius Phalereus, some time after he was driven out of Athens by the prevailing power of Demetrius Poliorcetes, retired into Egypt, and was honourably received by Ptolemy Soter. This is mentioned by Cicero, Diodorus Siculus, Ælian, Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, Suidas, and other ancient writers ‡.

But none of these writers give us the least intimation

phus. His having written so agreeably to the scripture, seems to prove him to have been a Jew. Connect. vol. iii. p. 66.

Fabricius enumerates above a hundred Demetrii. Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 390.

* Tertull. Apoll. § 19. Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. ix. c. 42.

† Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. iii. p. 117.

‡ Phalereus Demetrius cum patriâ pulsus esset injuriâ, ad Ptolemæum se regem Alexandriam contulit. Cic. de Fin. l. v. c. 19.

Εφυγεν προς Πτολεμαιον εις Αιγυπτον, ad Ptolemæum in Ægyptum perfugit. Diod. Sic. l. xx. p. 782.

Εν Αιγυπτῳ δε, συνων τῳ Πτολεμαιῳ, νομοθεσιας ηρξε. In Ægypto apud Ptolemæum scribendis legibus præfuit. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. iii. c. 17.

Diog. Laert. l. v. § 78.

Πρωτος των Πτολεμαιου φιλων, amicorum Ptolemæi omnium primus. Plut. de Exil. p. 601.

Παρα τῳ Σωτηρι Πτολεμαιῳ διατριβων, apud Ptolemæum Soterem degens. Suidas.

Strab. l. ix. p. 610.

of

of his continuing in favour with Ptolemy Philadelphus. On the contrary, Diogenes Laertius, on the authority of Hermippus, informs us, that Demetrius had given great offence to Philadelphus, by endeavouring to persuade Ptolemy Soter to leave his dominions to Ceraunus *, his elder son, by a former marriage; that Philadelphus, after the death of his father, ordered him to be taken into custody, and confined, till he had determined, in what manner he should treat him; and that, in the mean time, he was killed by the bite of an asp †. This was probably soon after he was apprehended, as his confinement was only a temporary expedient ‡.

Hermippus adds, that "Demetrius was buried near Diospolis," a city of Egypt, in the Delta, not far from

* Ceraunus was Ptolemy's eldest son, by Eurydice the daughter of Antipater. Appian. de Bell. Syr. p. 128. al. 207. Ptolemy Philadelphus was a younger son, by his second wife, Berenice.

† Και πως υπνωττων, υπ' ασπιδος την χειρα δηχθεις, τον βιον μετεθηκε. Ac fortè dormitans, ab aspide manum morsus, ex vitâ migravit. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 78. edit. Meibomii. Cicero seems to intimate, that the death of Demetrius was not accidental: Aspide ad corpus *admotâ*, vitâ esse privatum. Orat. pro Rab. Posth.

The excellent Corsini supposes, that his death was voluntary: animi ægritudine perculsus, aspidis morsu sibi mortem conscivit. Fast. Attic. tom. iv. p. 80.

Simson, in his Chronicon, explains the words of Diogenes Laertius above-cited in a manner, something different from the generality of commentators; and his learned editor Wesselingius acquiesces in his interpretation: Aspidis morsum, sine dolore letiferum esse aiunt. Itaque Ælianus de Animal. l. ix. c. 11. scripsit, τον [θανατον] εκ του δηγματος της ασπιδος, πρᾳον ειναι και αβληχρον, "lenem & imbecillem mortem esse, quæ aspidis morsu afferretur." Talis igitur Demetrii mors innuitur fuisse, qui dormitanti similis (υπνωττοντως) vitâ excessisse dicitur. Simsonii Chron. sub an. 3721. edit. Wesseling. 1729.

‡ Petavius, Corsini, &c. place the death of Demetrius in the first year of the CXXIV Olympiad, bef. Chr. 284. Ration. Temp. l. iii. c. 18. Corsin. loc. cit.

the Mendesian channel of the Nile. From which, I think, we may infer, that he had been banished from the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

The testimony of Hermippus is of great weight in this instance, as he was an accurate historian, and lived about the time of Ptolemy Philopator *; and therefore could scarcely be at a loss for authentic information, relative to one of the most illustrious men of his age.

It must be acknowledged, that Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, and others †, have asserted, that Demetrius was greatly respected by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and principally concerned in obtaining the translation of the Bible, commonly called the Septuagint.

* Hermippus was of Smyrna. Athenæus calls him Καλλιμαχειος, from which it is supposed he was one of the disciples of Callimachus. Deipnos. l. ii. p. 58. l. v. p. 213. He wrote many books, and particularly the lives of eminent men, which are frequently cited by Diogenes Laertius, under the title of Βιοι. D. Laert. l. i. § 33. l. ii. § 13. l. v. § 2. He flourished about the year bef. Chr. 220. Vid. Voss. de Hist. Græc. l. i. c. 16. Jons. de Scrip. Hist. Phil. l. ii. c. 9. § 4. Dodwell. de Cyclis, dissert. iii. § 12.

Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Josephus, and other ancient writers, speak of him with applause.

Ἑρμιππος ακριβης εν τοις αλλοις γενομενος. Dionys. Halic. de Isæo, p. 104.

Ανηρ περι πασαν ἱστοριαν επιμελης, vir circa omnem historiam diligens indagator. Jos. cont. Apion. l. i. § 22.

† Aristeæ Historia LXXII Interpretum. Oxon. 1692. Aristob. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. xiii. c. 12.—Aristobulus is supposed to have lived about 125 years before Christ. Prid. Connect. vol. ii. p. 41. Philo de Vitâ Mosis, l. ii. Jos. Antiq. l. xii. c. 2. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 22. p. 410. Tertul. Apol. § 18. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. iv. c. 34. Epiph. de Mens. & Pond. c. 9.

The book, which is transmitted down to us under the name of Aristeas, is apparently the foundation of all that has been said, concerning the manner of making this version by seventy-two elders, sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria for that purpose. The ecclesiastical writers adopted his narration with implicit credulity (as it seemed to do honour to the Scriptures) and embellished it with the story of the seventy-two cells *, the wonderful agreement of the interpreters, their prophetical inspiration †, and other circumstances, equally absurd and incredible ‡. But the most judicious writers reject it as a fiction, contrived by some Hellenistic Jew, in order to give a sanction to the Greek translation of the scriptures, and advance the glory of his own nation ‖.

"Demetrius Phalereus," as Plutarch relates, "advised king Ptolemy to collect and read such books, as treated of the government of states and kingdoms; for," says he, "they contain that salutary counsel, which friends never venture to give their sovereigns §."

The author of the Dissertation contends, that these words cannot be referred to Ptolemy Soter, an aged and learned prince; that it is evident they were addressed to

* Just. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 13. Epiph. de Mens. & Pond. c. 3.

† Philo. loc. cit.

‡ Nescio quis primus auctor, septuaginta cellulas Alexandriæ mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarint. Hieron. in Pentat. præf. tom. iii. p. 14.

Quæ pridem à Ludovico Vive, Josepho Scaligero, aliisque magnis nominibus explosa; à Pseudo-Aristæâ, Judæo-Hellenistâ, ad conciliandam versioni isti auctoritatem conficta; à veteribus credulâ nimis, ut solent, mente suscepta, avidiùs autem à Latinis et recentioribus defensa. Spanhemii Introd. ad Hist. p. 157.

‖ Vid. Hodii de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

§ Plut. in Apophthegm. Regum, p. 189.

Philadelphus, who considered Demetrius, not only as his preceptor, but as his parent.

In answer to this objection I must observe, that if Demetrius went into Egypt in the year before Christ 308 *, as Eusebius says he did, he might very properly give Ptolemy Soter this advice; for Ptolemy did not assume the title of king, till the year 305 †, and most probably had not then begun to form his library.

If, as I rather think, he retired into Egypt on the death of Cassander ‡, in 298, he was there in the seventh year of Ptolemy Soter; and as he lived with that prince above 13 years, in the character of his legislator, his counsellor, and his friend, he might give this advice without any kind of impropriety, either to the father or the son, and yet afterwards incur the displeasure of the latter, as Hermippus relates.

Our author, in conformity to his hypothesis, which makes Demetrius Phalereus the writer of the Parian Chronicle, maintains, that this learned Athenian was living in the CXXIX Olympiad, when the Chronicle is supposed to have been compiled.

Let us consider the probability of this opinion in a chronological view. Demetrius was appointed governor of Athens in the year 318, and, for the space of ten years, discharged that important office with so much

* Fuga Demetrii in Ægyptum incidit in Olymp. cxviii. 2. i. e. bef. Chr. 307. Bruckeri Hist. Crit. Phil. vol. i. p. 857. Petavius and Corsinus place it in the same year. Rat. Temp. l. iii. c. 18. Fasti Attici, vol. iv. p. 67.

† In this reign Ptolemy the astronomer places the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Soter.

‡ Μετα την Κασσανδρου τελευτην, ηναγκασθη φυγειν εις Αιγυπτον, Cassandro mortuo, fugere in Ægyptum fuerit coactus, Strab. l. ix. p. 610. In this article, Strabo corroborates the testimony of Hermippus.

probity and wisdom *, that three hundred and sixty statues were erected to his honour †. Athens was at that time in a situation, which required the most consummate policy and prudence in a governor. We may therefore presume, that his abilities were well known, and that he was 35 or 40 years of age, when he was elected ‡. If he was, it is highly improbable he should compose the Chronicle fifty-four years afterwards.

Plutarch dates the authority of Demetrius in the government of Athens, from the time of the Lamian war ‖, between the Athenians and Antipater, in the second year of the CXIV Olympiad, bef. Chr. 323 years. This makes an interval of fifty-nine years, between his appearing at Athens in a public character, and the date of the Parian inscription.

This argument may be still farther confirmed by the testimony of Athenæus. "Ctesicles," says that writer, "in the third book of his Chronica, asserts, that in the CX Olympiad, Demetrius Phalereus enumerated the inhabitants of Attica, and found that there were 21,000 Athenians, 10,000 sojourners or foreigners, and 400,000 slaves §." This was 337 years before the Christian

* Fuit enim hic vir non solùm eruditissimus, sed etiam civis è republicâ maximè, tuendæque civitatis peritissimus. Cic. de Leg. l. ii. sub fin. Αθηνησιν επιφανεϛατα επολιτευσατο, Athenis summâ cum gloriâ rempublicam rexit. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. iii. c. 17.

† Diog. Laert. l. v. § 75.

‡ Ἡρεθη, electus est. Diod. Sic. l. xviii. p. 647. Olymp. CXV. 3. bef. Chr. 318.

‖ Plut. in v. Demet. p. 893. Diod. Sic. l. xviii. p. 596.

§ Κτησικλης δε εν τριτη Χρονικων, τη δεκατη, προς ταις εκατον φησιν Ολυμπιαδι, κ, τ. λ. Athen. l. vi. p. 272. There is probably an error in the text of Athenæus; but, till we have authority to correct it, we must take it as it stands. Demetrius might be in some public station, and make this computation several years before he was appointed governor by Cassander.

era,

æra, and 73 years before the date of the Chronicle. According to this account, it is utterly incredible, that Demetrius ſhould be any ways concerned in that performance.

The preſumptive evidence againſt our author's opinion, which ariſes from the SILENCE of all the writers of antiquity, with reſpect to the Parian Chronicle, is, in this inſtance, remarkably ſtrong, if not deciſive. Demetrius Phalereus was not a writer of an inferior claſs, or an obſcure rhetorician; but an author of the higheſt diſtinction, whoſe name and character would have given ſo much authority to the inſcription, that it muſt have excited the attention of ſucceeding hiſtorians, biographers, or chronologiſts. But as not one of them has either cited or mentioned it, we can never ſuppoſe, that it was the production of this illuſtrious philoſopher and legiſlator.

"Cùm nuſquam occurrit mentio libri," ſays Le Clerc, "nomine philoſophi inſigniti, falſa ſit inſcriptio, aut minimùm ſuſpecta fiat neceſſe eſt; quia credibile non eſt, librum, inſignis præſertim philoſophi, potuiſſe non modò fugere diligentiam Diogenis Laertii, ſed etiam ita ſperni, ut nuſquam citaretur ab iis, qui frequenter de eo philoſopho verba fecerunt, nec raro aliorum ejus operum meminerunt *."

* Clerici Art. Crit. p. iii. ſect. 2. c. 3. vol. ii. p. 337.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

THIRDLY, it may be objected, that the works of ſome eminent writers of antiquity, ſuch as Phædrus, Q. Curtius, &c. lay in obſcurity for many centuries, and were not diſcovered till later ages.

To obviate this objection, it will be neceſſary to conſider the peculiar circumſtances of theſe authors.

1. Phædrus is ſaid to have been the freedman of Auguſtus, or Tiberius. Saxius places him in the reign of Claudius, 48 years after the Chriſtian æra *. His fables were firſt publiſhed by Pet. Pithœus, in 1596.

Martial certainly means this fabuliſt, when he aſks, if Canius Rufus, a poet of Gades,

Æmulatur IMPROBI JOCOS Phædri †.

IMPROBUS plainly alludes to the ſatire, which Phædrus conceals under the actions or the dialogues of birds and beaſts. Accordingly, Rigaltius, Gudius, and others, ſuppoſe, that the HYDRUS, in the ſecond fable, repreſents Caligula.

The word *jocos* evidently points out the fabuliſt. Æſop's fables are called by Ariſtophanes, Heſychius, and others, γελοια, joci ‡.

The ſame expreſſion is uſed by Avienus, when he ſays, the fables of Æſop, "ſub *jocorum* communium

* Sax. Onomaſt. vol. i. p. 241.

† Mart. l. iii. ep. 20. Vid. l. i. 62. iii. 64.—Martial wrote about the year 94.

‡ ——Αισωπου τι γελοιον. Ariſtoph. Veſp. v. 564.——Αισωπικον γελοιον. Ibid. v. 1251.——Αισωπου γελοια. Heſych. Dion. Chryſ. Orat. 82. p. 631.

ſpecie,

ſpecie, vitæ argumenta contineant;" and by Phædrus himſelf, when he ſpeaks of his own productions:

> Fictis *jocari* nos meminerit fabulis.—
> Calumniámque fictis eluſit *jocis* *.

We do not find, that Phædrus is mentioned by any other writer, till we come to Avienus, who is ſuppoſed to have lived about the year 410. This fabuliſt, in his dedication to Theodoſius [Macrobius] expreſsly mentions the five books of Phædrus: "Phædrus etiam partem aliquam quinque in libellos reſolvit."

But Seneca, it is obſerved, has given ſome intimation, that there were no fables in the Roman language in his time; for he thus writes to Polybius: "Non audeo te uſque eo producere, ut fabellas quoque, et Æſopeos logos †, intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus, ſolitâ tibi venuſtate connectas ‡."

In order to account for this obſervation, ſome have imagined, that Phædrus's work was in few hands, and unknown to Seneca; or that he did not think of it, when he was writing to Polybius ‖. Pithœus, Lipſius, and Voſſius, ſuppoſe, that Phædrus is not mentioned in this paſſage, becauſe he was not a Roman, but a Thracian. Vavaſſor conceives, that his fables were ſuppreſſed, or not noticed, becauſe the ſatirical alluſions

* Phæd. Prol. v. 7. Id. ad Eutychum, l. iii. 37. l. iv. 6. 2.

† Æſopei logi, i. e. apologi, fabulæ.

Æſop is called by Diogenes Laertius, ὁ λογοποιος, fabularum ſcriptor. Lib. i. § 72. Λογων Αισωπειων συναγωγαι, fabularum Æſopiarum collectiones, are mentioned by the ſame author, among the works of Demetrius Phalereus. In the edition of Meibomius, 1692, the word λογων is improperly tranſlated *orationum*, inſtead of *fabularum*. Lib. v. § 80.

‡ Sen. Conſol. ad Polyb. c. 27.

‖ Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. ii. c. 3, vol. i. p. 373.

they

they contain were obnoxious to the tyrants of those days *.

Fabricius, from the words *connectas* and *resolverit*, c. 30. infers, that Seneca could not properly mention Phædrus, as he was not then speaking of Æsopic fables in verse, but of similar compositions in prose †.

Upon these grounds learned writers have contended, that the fables of Phædrus might have been extant in the time of Seneca, notwithstanding the preceding remark.

It is acknowledged, that they are not mentioned by any writer, except Martial, before Avienus, in the fifth century.

In this case, we can only suppose, that the general silence of the ancients might have been owing to several causes, or concurring circumstances; such as, the character of Phædrus, as a freedman, a minor poet, a copyer of Æsop, and the author of compositions, which no historian could have any occasion to cite; or probably to some contingencies, which I shall consider in the next article.

11. It is alleged, that the history of Alexander the Great, by Q. Curtius, is neither quoted, nor mentioned by any of the ancients.

Who Q. Curtius was, and when he lived, are points, which cannot be determined with any certainty. Tacitus and the younger Pliny speak of one Curtius Rufus, who was proconsul of Africa, in the reign of Tiberius

* Vavassor de Ludicrâ Dictione. p. 208. edit. 1658. Morhof. de Patav. Livianâ. c. 12. p. 158.

† Fabric. Bibl. Lat. loc. cit. Id. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 9. § 12. But see the use of the word *resolvit*, in the passage above cited from Avienus.

berius *, about the year 37. And as Tacitus obſerves, that he lived to "a very advanced age †," Voſſius imagines he might be alive, and write, or finiſh, his hiſtory in the reign of Veſpaſian: that is, in or after the year 69; for there are many paſſages in it, which, he thinks, evidently allude to that period ‡.

One Q. Curtius Rufus is mentioned by Suetonius, in his catalogue of the celebrated rhetoricians; and he is ſuppoſed by Caſaubon, Voſſius, Perizonius, Fabricius, and others, to have been the author of the hiſtory in queſtion.

Pliny, in an epiſtle to Saturninus, applauds one of his friends, whoſe name was Rufus, and ſays, Legi librum omnibus numeris abſolutum, "I have read his book, which is highly finiſhed ‖." But there is no circumſtance in this epiſtle, which can lead us to infer, with any certainty, that Pliny alludes to the Hiſtory of Alexander.

It has been obſerved, that Quintilian, who wrote about the year 88, and mentions the moſt conſiderable hiſtorians §, takes no notice of Q. Curtius; and from this, and other circumſtances, ſome have inferred, that the Hiſtory of Alexander, which is now extant under the name of Q. Curtius, is a modern compoſition. But this inference is arbitrary and illogical. Quintilian does not attempt to mention all the eminent hiſtorians THEN extant. He takes not the leaſt notice of A. Hirtius, Cornelius Nepos, Trogus Pompeius, and many others,

* Tacit. Annal. l. xi. c. 20, 21. Plin. Epiſt. l. vii. c. 27.

† Longâ poſt hæc ſeneƈtâ. Tacit. loc. citat.

‡ Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. l. iv. c. 28. p. 146. Saxii Onomaſticon, p. 258.

‖ Plin. l. ix. 38.

§ Quint. l. x. c. 1.

Montfaucon asserts, that there was a manuscript copy of Q. Curtius in M. Colbert's library at Paris, above 800 years old *. Fabricius observes, that this historian is quoted by Petrus Blæsensis, who wrote about the year 1150; by Johannes Sarisburiensis about the year 1170; and by Vincentius Bellovacensis in the year 1244 †.

Antonius Panormita tells us, that Alphonsus, king of Arragon, who began his reign in 1252, was cured of an obstinate indisposition by the delight he took in reading the history of Alexander, and used to rally his medical attendants by declaring, that Curtius was a much better physician than Avicenna ‡.

These testimonies, taken from writers of the twelfth and 13th centuries, are proofs, that the History of Alexander, ascribed to Q. Curtius, is not a modern composition.

Admitting then, that this history was written in the first century, and that it lay in obscurity for above a thousand years, we may account for the silence of the ancients on the following suppositions.

Let us only conceive, that the first part ‖ of this work was destroyed by some accident in the author's life-time, or after his death, before a second copy of it was taken, such a disaster might prevent its publication at first, and afterwards impede its general circulation.

* Montf. Palæog. Græc. præf. p. ii.

† Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. ii. c. 17. § 1.

‡ Frequenter in medicos rex jocatus, Avicennam, velut parabolanum, parvi facere, Curtium laudibus cumulare. Ant. Panormita de Dictis & Factis Alphonsi regis Aragonum. l. i. p. 14, 15. edit. 1538.

‖ The two first books are entirely lost; and there are four other deficiencies; namely, book v. ch. 13. b. vi. ch. 1. b. x. ch. 1. and 4, which Freinshemius and others have endeavoured to supply. ——The first edition of Q. Curtius was printed in 1474.

The

The manuscript, it is possible, might fall, as Aristotle's books did, into the hands of ανθρωποι ιδιωται, illiterate men *, or some βιβλιοταφος, some CURIOUS COLLECTOR

* Aristotle left his books to Theophrastus, who was his successor in the Lyceum. Theophrastus "bequeathed them to Neleus." [Diog. Laert. in v. Theoph. l. v. § 52.] who carried them to Scepsis. The heirs of Neleus were ιδιωται ανθρωποι, men of no learning, and kept them locked up. When they heard, that the king of Pergamus was collecting books for his library, they hid them in a hole under ground, where they were much damaged by the damp and worms. A long time afterwards they were sold to Apellico, a rich citizen of Athens, who was a lover of books, but no philosopher. Apellico caused them to be transcribed, and the deficiencies supplied; but this was done without either accuracy or judgement. After his death, 86 years before the Christian æra, Sylla took the city of Athens, and removed this library to Rome, where Tyrannio the grammarian had the use of Aristotle's works. Andronicus Rhodius received a copy of them from Tyrannio; and having corrected, and ranged them in order, presented them to the public. Strab. l. xiii. p. 906. Plut. in v. Syllæ, p. 468.

Athenæus reports, that all Aristotle's books, τα τουτων βιβλια παντα [legendum fortè τουτου] were bought of Neleus by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Deipnos. l. i. p. 3. Yet, in another place, he says, his library was bought by Apellico, l. v. p. 214. These seeming contradictions may perhaps be reconciled by supposing, that Ptolemy bought only copies of his writings.

Neleus was the disciple of Aristotle and Theophrastus. Aristotle died bef. Chr. 322 years; Theophrastus about 286; and Ptolemy Philadelphus came to the crown about two years afterwards. If this prince had any negociation with Neleus, it must have been in the former part of his reign. However, it is very probable, that either Athenæus, or some of his editors, have made a mistake in the passage, where Philadelphus is said to have bought all Aristotle's books of Neleus.

The disasters abovementioned have occasioned innumerable omissions, disarrangements, perplexities, and difficulties, in almost all the productions of Aristotle, and opened a wide field for the combats of his followers and commentators, which, in about three centuries after Albertus Magnus, that is, between the year 1260 and 1560,

LECTOR of books, who might keep it in durance for half a century, and then bequeath it to a ſucceſſor like himſelf. Theſe contingencies will account for the ſilence of Quintilian and his contemporaries.

There are various other reaſons, why a manuſcript may be with-held from public view, or confined to a few private hands; and theſe reaſons have ſo far operated, that many valuable writings have been ſuffered to moulder in oblivion for ſeveral ages.

Diogenes Laertius informs us, that the works of Thucydides, which the author left unfiniſhed, lay in obſcurity, till they were brought to light by Xenophon *.

But the caſe of the Parian Chronicle is widely different. It was neither left unfiniſhed, nor was it written on paper, or parchment, and, in that condition, liable to be concealed in a bookcaſe or a cheſt; but it WAS OSTENTATIOUSLY ENGRAVED ON MARBLE.

We may therefore ſtill aſſert, that, in this caſe, the ſilence of the ancients is unaccountable.

Before I conclude this chapter, I muſt obſerve, that a circumſtance, on which the preceding objection entirely depends, is rather taken for granted than proved, which is, the authenticity of the works, aſcribed to Phædrus and Q. Curtius †. If they are the productions of later ages, which indeed I do not ſuppoſe, the objection is at once ſuperſeded.

1560, amounted to 12,000 authors. Patricii Diſcuſſ. Peripat. l. x. p. 145.

* Diog. Laert. in v. Xenoph. l. ii. § 57.

† A collection of epiſtles, in five books, was publiſhed in 1500, under the name of one Q. Curtius; but they are ſtupid forgeries. Fabricius has condeſcended to reprint them, in his Bibliotheca Latina, vol. i. p. 644. edit. 1728.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

VI. SOME of the facts, mentioned in the Chronicle, seem to have been taken from writers of a later date.

In the following passages there is an APPEARANCE of imitation; or a stronger resemblance, than such as may be supposed to arise from accident.

PASSAGES in the PARIAN CHRONICLE.	PARALLEL PASSAGES in GREEK AUTHORS.
Epoc. 1. Αφ ου Κεκροψ Αθηνων εβασιλευσε, και η χωρα Κεκροπια εκληθη, το προτερον καλουμενη Ακτικη απο Ακταιου του αυτοχθονος. A quo Cecrops Athenis regnavit, et regio Cecropia dicta est, quæ prius dicebatur Actiça ab Actæo indigenâ.	Κεκροψ της Αττικης εβασιλευσε πρωτός, και την γην, προτερον λεγομενην Ακτην, αφ' ἑαυτου Κεκροπιαν ωνομασεν. Cecrops in terrâ Atticâ primus regnavit, et quæ prius Acta dicebatur, de suo ipsius vocabulo Cecropiam dici voluit. Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 1. edit. Gal. 1675. c. 14. edit. Heyn. 1782. Απ' αυτου δε Κεκροπια ἡ χωρα εκληθη. Syncell. p. 153. Euseb. Chron. p. 28.
Epoc. 2. Αφ ου Δευκαλιων παρα τον Παρνασσον εν Λυκωρεια εβασιλευσε. A quo Deucalion apud Parnassum in Lycoriâ regnavit.	Δευκαλιων βασιλευειν των κατα Παρνασσον ηρξατο. Deucalion iis qui ad Parnassum imperitare cœpit. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 28. 109.

Epoc.

Epoc. 3. Αφ ου δικη Αθηνησι[ν εγε]νετο Αρει και Ποσειδωνι υπερ Αλιρροθιου του Ποσειδωνος· και ο τοπος εκληθη Αρειος Παγος. A quo lis Athenis interceſſit Marti et Neptuno ſuper Halirrhothio, Neptuni filio, et locus dictus eſt Arius Pagus.

Ἁλιρρόθιος ὁ Ποσειδῶνος ὑπο Αρεος φωραθεις κτεινεται· Ποσειδων δε εν Αρειῳ Παγῳ κρινεται, δικαζοντων των δώδεκα θεων, Αρει, και [οὑτος] απολυεται *. Halirrothius, Neptuni fi. à Marte deprehenſus occiditur. Quamobrem Neptunus Martem in Areopago cædis reum agit. Is duodecim deorum ſententiâ judicatus abſolvitur. Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 2. edit. 1675. c. 14. edit. 1782. Αρειος Παγος εκληθη. Syncell. p. 153. Euſeb. Chron. p. 110.

Epoc. 4. Αφ᾽ ου κατακλυσμος επι Δευκαλιωνος εγενετο, και Δευκαλιων τους ομβρους εφυγεν εγ Λυκωρειας εις Αθηνας προ[ς Κρανα]ον . . . και τα σωτηρια εθυσεν. A quo diluvium, tempore Deucalionis evenit; et Deucalion imbres fugit è Lycoriâ, Athenas ad Cranaüm, et ſacra pro ſalute fecit.

Εφ᾽ ὁυ τον επι Δευκαλιωνος λεγεται κατακλυσμον γενεσθαι . . . τῳ Παρνασσῳ προσισχει, κἀκει των ομβρων παυλαν λαβοντων, εκβας εθυσε Διΐ Φυξιῳ. Sub quo [Cranao] Deucalionis diluvium fuiſſe narratur . . . . Parnaſſum demum appellit, ibíque cùm imbres deſiiſſent, egreſſus, Jovi Phyxio ſacris operatur.

* Scaliger, having obſerved, that this paſſage is corrupt and imperfect, ſays, the author means: Ποσειδωνος δε εισαγοντος, εν Αρειῳ Παγῳ κρινεται, δικαζοντων των δωδεκα θεων, Αρης, και απολυεται. Scal. in Euſeb. Chron. p. 31. Gale gives the text, as it is here cited, and ſubjoins this remark: Græci ſic loquuntur, κρινεται Αρει, diſceptat cum Marte. Not. in loc.

tur. Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 5. c. 14. edit. 1782. Id. l. i. c. 7. § 2.

This account of Deucalion, in the Parian Chronicle, is not consistent with what we find in some of the principal writers of antiquity.

Herodotus, Apollodorus, Conon, Strabo, Ovid, Justin, Eusebius, and others, affirm, that at the time of the deluge, Deucalion reigned in Thessaly *.

Apollodorus relates, that the mountains of Thessaly were divided or torn asunder by the flood †; and that Deucalion, after being carried along nine days and nights upon the water, landed at last on Parnassus, and THERE offered sacrifices to Jupiter Phyxius.

There are some improbabilities attending the story, as it is told in the Chronicle. 1. The deluge is supposed to have happened 45 years after Deucalion began his reign in Lycoria. 2. Lycoria, according to Pausanias, was a city, built on the TOP of Parnassus, by those, who had escaped the deluge; and consequently could not exist 45 years before that event. 3. It is scarcely probable, that Deucalion would leave the top of Parnassus, or Lycoria, where he is said to have been long settled, and go to another country, on this occasion, either for safety, or for the purpose of offering a sacrifice to Jupiter for his preservation. Lastly, if there had

* Herod. l. i. c. 56. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2. Conon, Narrat. 27. Strab. l. ix. p. 660. Ovid. Metam. l. i. v. 317. Just. l. ii. c. 6. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 110. Hellanicus apud Schol. in Apoll. Rhod. l. iii. v. 1085.

† Τα ορη διεστη, montes dirempti sunt diluvio, recessere. These words are improperly rendered by Ægius Spoletinus, Gale, &c. montes aquarum diluvio *immunes fuere*. Vid. Herod. l. vii. c. 129. Strab. l. ix. p. 658. Sen. Nat. Quæst. vi. 25.

been

been any authority for ſaying, that Deucalion went to Athens, and there made his offering, and built a temple to Jupiter, it is hardly probable, that theſe two circumſtances, ſo much to the honour of that city, would have been totally omitted by Apollodorus, an Athenian writer.

We are told indeed by Pauſanias *, that Deucalion lived for ſome time at Athens, and there built a temple to Jupiter Olympius, and had a ſepulchre near the temple. But Pauſanias only gives us the ſtory of his building a temple, as an uncertain tradition, *λεγουσι* † ; and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus obſerves, that ſepulchral monuments were frequently erected to eminent men, in places, where they were not buried ‡. This objection is entirely removed, if, as Meurſius aſſerts, the temple at Athens, aſcribed to Deucalion by Pauſanias and Strabo ||, was not built by Deucalion king of Theſſaly, but by Deucalion, the ſon of Minos, king of Crete §.

Epoc. 6. Αφ ου Ελλην ο Δευκ[αλιωνος Φθι]ωτιδος εβασιλευσε, και Ελληνες [ων]ομασθησαν το προτερον Γραικοι καλουμενοι, και τον αγωνα παναθ[η]ναι[κον συνεστησαντο.] A

Αυτος μεν ουν [Ἑλλην] αφ' αὐτου τους καλουμενους Γραικους προσηγορευσεν Ἑλληνας... Εριχθονιος των Παναθηναιων την ἑορτην συνεστησατο. Is quidem de ſe Hellenas, qui

* Pauſ. l. x. c. 6.

† Id. l. i. c. 18.

‡ Dionyſ. Halic. l. i. p. 43.

|| Strab. l. ix. p. 651.

§ Meurſius, having quoted the words of Pauſanias, adds, " De hoc Deucalione, Minois filio, locus iſte capiendus, non de illo altero, Prometheo nato ; ſub quo celeberrimum id diluvium accidiſſe fertur. Quin ætatem illic porrò omnem egit ; cúmque diem obiiſſet, prope extructum à ſe templum eſt ſepultus. Meurſ. Creta, l. iii. c. 3. p. 137.

quo

quo Hellen Deucalionis f. in Phthiotide regnavit, & Hellenes appellati sunt, qui prius Græci dicebantur, et certamen Panatheniacum instituerunt *.

postea † Græci vocati sunt, nominavit. . . . Erichthonius Panathenæorum celebritatem instituit. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2. § 3. edit. 1782. l. iii. c. 13. § 6. c. 14. edit. 1782.

Epoc. 28. Αφ ου Νη[λ]ευς ωκισ[εν εγ Καρια Μιλητον, αγειρας Ιωνας, οι ωκισ]αν Εφεσον, Ερυθρας, Κλαζομενας, [Πριηνην, και Λεβεδον, Τεω] Κολοφωνα, [Μ]υουντα, [Φωκαιαν] Σαμον [Χιον, και] τα [Παν]ιωνι[α] εγενετο. A quo Neleus condidit *in Caria* Miletum, congregatis Ionibus, qui condiderunt Ephesum, Erythras, Clazomenas, *Prienen, et Lebedum, Teon*, Colophonem, Myuntem, *Phoceam*, Samum, *Chium*, *Pan*ionia instituta fuere.

Νηλευς δε εις την Ιωνιαν αφικετο, και πρωτον μεν ωκισε Μιλητον, Καρας εξελασας . . . αφ' ὧν ἁι δωδεκα πολεις εκληθησαν εν Ιωνια. Εισι δε ἁιδε· Μιλητος, Εφεσος, Ερυθραι, Κλαζομεναι, Πριηνη, Λεβεδος, Τεως, Κολοφων, Μυους, Φωκαια, Σαμος, και Χιος. Neleus autem pervenit in Ioniam, et primùm condidit Miletum, ejectis Caribus, ... à quibus duodecem Ioniæ civitates appellatæ sunt. Sunt autem hæ: Miletus, Ephesus, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Priena, Lebedus, Teus, Colophon, Myûs, Phocæa, Samus and Chius. Ælian.

* The Panathenæa are said to have been first instituted by Erichthonius, fifteen years after the date of this epocha. See Epoc. x. and Apollod. loc. cit.

† Ægius Spoletinus and Dr. Gale insert the word *postea*; but it is a mistake instead of *antea* or *prius*. Ὁι καλουμενοι τοτε μεν Γραικοι, νυν δε Ἑλληνες, qui tunc appellabantur Græci, nunc autem Hellenes. Arist. Meteor. l. i. c. 14. Γραιοι and γραικοι may perhaps signify *antiqui*, ancients, or old inhabitants.

Var. Hist. l. viii. c. 5. edit. Gronov. 1731.

The names of six, and, if the lacunæ are properly supplied, the names of twelve cities, appear to have been engraved on the marble, exactly as we find them in Ælian's Various History. But there is not any imaginable reason for this particular arrangement. It does not correspond with the time of their foundation, with their situation in Ionia, with their relative importance, or with the order, in which they are placed by other eminent historians.

These twelve cities are thus enumerated by Herodotus: Miletus, Myus, Priene, Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samos, Chios, Erythræ *.

By Strabo: Ephesus, Miletus, Myus, Lebedus, Colophon, Priene, Teus, Erythræ, Phocæa, Clazomenæ, Chius, Samus †.

By Paterculus: Ephesus, Miletus, Colophon, Priene, Lebedus, Myus, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samos, Chios, &c. ‡.

By Pausanias: Miletus, Ephesus, Myus, Priene, Colophon, Lebedus, Teus, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samus, Chius ‖.

By Suidas: Ephesus, Miletus, Myus, Priene, Colophon, Teos, Lebedus, Erythræ, Phocæa, Clazomenæ, Chios, Samos §.

These cities are mentioned by some other ancient

* Herod. l. i. c. 142.

† Strab. l. xiv. p. 938.

‡ V. Paterc. l. i. c. 4.

‖ Pausan. l. vii. c. 2—4.

§ Suidas in v. Ἰωνία.—Suidas seems to have taken his list from Strabo, or Pausanias, with some little variation.

writers; but not by any of them in the order, in which they are enumerated by Ælian *, and the author of the Chronicle.

It is observable, that six names may be transposed 720 different ways; and that twelve names admit of 479,001,600 different transpositions. Supposing then, that there is no particular reason for one arrangement rather than another, it will follow, that the chance of two authors, placing them in the same order, is, in the former case, as 1 to 720; and, in the latter, as 1 to 479,001,600.

It is therefore utterly improbable, that these names would have been placed in this order on the marble, if the author of the inscription had not transcribed them from the historian.

Epoc. 38. [Αφ ου Αμφικτυόνες ενικησαν ελ]οντες Κυῤῥαν, και ο αγων ο γυμνικός ετεθη χρηματιτης απο των λαφυρων, ετη ΗΗ[Η]ΔΔΠΙΙ, αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμω[ν]ος. A quo Amphictyones vicerunt, captâ Cyrrhâ, et certamen gymnicum editum fuit pecuniarium ex spoliis, anni CCCXXVII, archonte Athenis Simone.	Τον Πυθικον αγωνα διεθηκεν Ευρυλοχος ὁ Θεσσαλος, συν τοις Αμφικτυοσι, τους Κιῤῥαιους καταπολεμησας . . . επι αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμωνος, και νικησας εθεχο χρηματικον αγωνα. Pythicum certamen instituit Eurylochus Thessalus, unà cum Amphictyonibus, cum Cirrhæos debellasset... archonte Athenis Simone, victoriâque partâ chrematitem agonem decrevit. Pind. Schol. arg. 4. in Pyth. p. 163. edit. Oxon. 1697.
Epoc. 39. Αφ ου [ο στε- φ]ανιτης αγων παλιν ετεθη, ετη	Επι μεν Αθηνησιν αρχοντος Δαμασιου, ὑςερον και ςεφανιτην

† Ælian wrote about the year aft. Chr. 225. Saxii Onom.

ΗΗΗΔ[Δ]ΙΙ, αρχοντος Αθηνησι Δαμασιου του δευτερου. A quo coronarium certamen iterùm editum fuit, anni CCCXXII, archonte Athenis Damasiâ secundo.

εθεντο. Archonte Athenis quidem Damasiâ, iterum coronarium statuerunt. Pind. Schol. arg. 2. in Pyth.

Epoc. 52. Αφ ου Ξερξης την σχεδιαν εζευξεν εν Ελλησποντω, και τον Αθω διωρυξε. A quo Xerxes navigiorum pontem junxit in Hellesponte, & Athonem perfodit.

Ξερξης διωρυξε και τον Αθω, εζευξε και τον Ἑλλησποντον. Xerxes perfodit et Athon, & Hellespontum ponte junxit. Suidas v. Ξερξης. Vid. Isoc. Paneg. p. 127, edit. Cantab. 1686.

Epoc. 53. Και το πυρ ερυη[σε εν Σικ]ελια, περι την Αιτνιαν *. Et ignis defluxit in Sicilia circa Ætnam.

Ερρυη δε περι αυτο το εαρ τουτο ὁ ρυαξ του πυρος εκ της Αιτνης. Per idem ver ignis rivus ex Ætnâ effluxit †. Thucyd. l. iii. sub fin.

The eruption of mount Ætna, which Thucydides mentions in this passage, happened in the archonship of Euthydemus, bef. Chr. 426. In the next sentence, he speaks of another eruption, πεντηκοστῳ ετει, fifty years before; that is, when Phædon was archon, in the year 476, or, according to the opinion of Corsini, when Dromoclides was archon, in 475. This is the eruption, mentioned by the author of the Chronicle; but he places it three or four years too early, in the archonship of Xanthippus, bef. Chr. 479.

* Αιτνιαν. Αιτνα for Αιτνη, Dor. but the ι in Αιτνιαν is a mistake, either of the author, or the stone-cutter.

† This passage is only produced as an imitation, or something like an imitation, of a writer, preceding the CXXIX Olympiad.

Epoc.

Epoc. 58. Αφ ου εν Αιγος ποταμοις ο λιθος επεσε. A quo in Ægos flumen lapis cecidit.

Λιθος εκ του ουρανου επεσεν εν ποταμοις Αιγος. Lapis in Ægis fluvio de coelo ruit. Euseb. Chron. p. 168. 131.

It is worthy of observation, how the ancients differ with respect to the place, from which this stone is supposed to have fallen. Aristotle says, it was snatched up by a whirlwind, and fell εκ του αερος, out of the air *. Pliny and Diogenes Laertius assert, that it fell εκ του ηλιου, from the sun †. Silenus, Plutarch, Philostratus, Eusebius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Tzetzes ‡, tell us, that it fell εκ του ουρανου, from the sky. Our author contents himself with saying, that it fell into the river Ægos. Does not this deviation from the opinion, and the language of the ancients, seem to encourage a suspicion, that the writer of the Chronicle lived in later times, when men had learned to explode such an absurdity, as that of a stone, as big as a mill-stone, falling out

* Arist. Meteor. l. i. c. 7.

† Plin. l. ii. c. 58.—Pliny says, it was, magnitudine vehis, a cart-load.—Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 10.

‡ Silenus apud Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 11. In this passage Scaliger reads διμυλον λιθον, a stone as large as two mill-stones. Scal. Animad. in Euseb. Chron. p. 102. Kühnius thus reprobates the word διμυλον: " μυλου λιθος idem est quod μυλιτης, molaris; διμυλος λιθος vero æque absurdum est, ac si dicerem τριμυλος." Kühnii Observ. in loc.

Plut. in v. Lysand. p. 439.—Plutarch calls it, παμμεγεθης λιθος, a very large stone.

Philost. in v. Apollon. l. i. c. 2.—This writer says, λιθοι, stones.

Euseb. loc. cit.

Am. Marcell. l. xxii. p. 212. 236.—Marcellinus says, lapides, stones.

Tzet. Chil. vi.—Tzetzes likewise says, λιθοι, stones.

out of the air, from the ſun, from the ſky, or from heaven?

If, upon conſidering theſe parallel paſſages, it ſhould appear, that they really exhibit a ſimilarity of ſentiment and expreſſion, which could not reſult from chance, it will be neceſſary to enquire, from what ſource this coincidence ariſes.

It is not probable, that the hiſtorians, geographers, and miſcellaneous writers of antiquity, living in different ages, and in diſtant countries, would, in caſes of no particular importance, incidentally introduced, uſe the words of an inſcription in the iſland of Paros. And if, in ſome inſtances, they might have borrowed the words of ſuch an inſcription, it is not probable, that they would have deviated from the general cuſtom of their contemporaries, by ſuppreſſing the name of the author, whoſe expreſſions they adopted, and on whoſe authority they depended.

2. It is not probable, that the inſcription has been copied by ſeveral writers, particularly by writers, who lived many centuries after its date; becauſe, upon this ſuppoſition, it muſt have been generally known and conſulted; which is ſo far from being the caſe, that there is not an author now remaining, who appears to have either ſeen or heard of ſuch an inſcription.

3. It is not probable, that the inſcription was collected from preceding writers, as early as the CXXIX Olympiad; and that others have drawn their information from the ſame original ſources, and therefore employed the ſame expreſſions; firſt, becauſe it is generally acknowledged *, that the Greeks, at that time, had no idea of any regular, chronological ſyſtem, like the Parian Chronicle; and ſecondly, becauſe we can hardly

* See chap. v. vi.

ſuppoſe,

ſuppoſe, that Greek writers of eminent abilities have ſervilely copied the words of their predeceſſors, on ordinary occaſions, where they have not appealed to their authority. Profeſſed compilers muſt be excepted.

I am very ſenſible, how difficult it is, in many caſes, to trace reſemblances, and fix upon unqueſtionable imitations, in different authors; but if there be any ſuch imitations in the paſſages I have cited, and any validity in the ſubſequent obſervations, we may conclude, that the facts and dates, contained in the Parian Chronicle, have been collected, by ſome modern writer, from the hiſtorical records of antiquity.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

VII. PARACHRONISMS appear in some of the epochas, which we can scarcely suppose a Greek chronologer, in the CXXIX Olympiad, would be liable to commit.

The following articles, among many others, which might be mentioned, seem to fall under this imputation.

In the 31st Epocha, Pheidôn the Argive, supposed to have been the eleventh from Hercules, is said to have made weights and measures, 895 years before the Christian æra.

There seems to be a considerable prochronism in this article. Eusebius and Syncellus place Pheidon in the year 800 *. Pausanias tells us, that Pheidon was a formidable tyrant, and interposed in a contest between the Eleans and the Pisæans, about the direction of the Olympic games, in the eighth Olympiad †, bef. Chr. 748. Strabo says, Pheidon himself assumed the power of superintending the games; but that he was soon afterwards deposed by the Eleans and Spartans. He makes him the tenth from Temenus ‡, who was unquestionably the fourth from Hercules.

Pheidon

* Euseb. Chron. p. 112. Ibid. Græc. 148. Syncell. p. 198.

† Pausan. l. vi. c. 22.

‡ Δεκατον μεν οντα απο Τημενου, decimum à Temeno. Strab. l. viii. p. 549. edit. 1707.—In the *Latin* translation of this passage, Pheidon is called, decimus ab HERCULE; for which, I think, there is no

Pheidon was brother to Caranus, who founded the kingdom of Macedon. Chronologers are not agreed concerning the beginning of this prince's reign; but the most probable opinion seems to be that of archbishop Usher, who places it about the year 794.

Paterculus brings Caranus, and consequently Pheidon, two generations lower than Strabo has done; for he says, he was the SIXTEENTH from Hercules *.

Sir Isaac Newton supposes Pheidon to have lived in the year 584; which is 311 years later, than the marble has placed him.

EPOC. 46. According to this epocha, the assassination of Hipparchus, and the expulsion of his brother Hippias, or that of the Pisistratidæ, happened in the same year. But it is universally agreed, that Hippias remained at Athens above three years after the death of his brother.

"The Athenians," says Herodotus, "during the space of FOUR years, were no less oppressed by tyranny than before †." Plato makes this an interval of THREE years ‡. Thucydides, with historical accuracy, says, "Hippias continued in possession of the tyranny at Athens THREE years; and in the FOURTH was deposed

no authority, but that of Xylander, who reads Ἡρακλέους, instead of Τημένου. Vid. Palmerii Exercit. p. 308.

Temenus was one of the three brothers, who conducted the celebrated expedition, called the Return of the Heraclidæ, bef. Chr. 1104. If Pheidon was ten generations, or 300 years, later, he must be supposed to have lived about the year 804.

* Sextus decimus ab Hercule. Paterc. l. i. c. 6.

† Επ' ετεα τεσσερα, per annos quatuor. Herod. l. v. § 55.

‡ Quo defuncto, τρια ετη, tres annos sub fratre illius Hippiâ, tyrannide pressi Athenienses fuerunt. Plat. in Hipparcho, vol. v, p. 263. edit. Bipont. 1784.

by the Lacedæmonians and the Alcmæonidæ, twenty years before the battle at Marathon *.

Epoc. 50. The author of the Chronicle asserts, that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, died in the archonship of Aristides, the year after the battle at Marathon.

Ctesias indeed relates, that "Darius returned into Persia, and died there, after an illness of thirty days †. But every one knows, how much the credit of Ctesias has been suspected ‡; besides, the death of Darius is mentioned, in a mere epitome of his history by Photius,

* Εν τῳ τεταρτῳ, quarto anno. Thucyd. l. vi. § 59.—Hipparchus was assassinated, Olymp. LXVI. 3. bef. Chr. 514. Hippias was banished, Olymp. LXVII. 2. bef. Chr. 510. Hippiæ fuga in excunte anno secundo Olymp. LXVII constitui debet. Corsin. Valesii Except. Peiresc. p. 42.

† Δαρειος δε επανελθων εις Περσας, και θυσας, και ἡμερας νοσησας λ', τελευτα, Darius autem ad Persas reversus est, ubi celebratis sacrificiis, quum triginta dies morbo laborasset, mortuus est. Ctesiæ Fragm. apud Phot. Bibl. cod. 72. Herod. Op. p. 816. edit. 1763.

‡ Μυθων απιθανων και παραφορων εμβεβληκεν εις τα βιβλια παντοδαπην συρφετον, fabularum absurdarum et insulsarum in libros suos variam colluviem infarsit. Plut. in v. Artax. p. 1012.

Κτησιας ουκ αξιοπιστος, Ctesias non fide dignus. Arist. Hist. Animal. l. viii. c. 28.

In this passage Aristotle alludes to the Indica of Ctesias. But might not Ctesias as well forge his Assyrian history, as create the world of monsters he talks of in India? And might we not as justly suspect him of falshood, when he pretends, that he compiled his history from original records, as when he gravely affirms, that he was an eye-witness of what no person of sense can believe? Vid. Ctesiæ Indica apud Photium, cod. 73.

Herodotus, say the authors of the Universal History, may be justly styled the father of history, and agrees better with the sacred writings than any other profane historian; whereas it will be difficult to find a more romantic and fabulous author than Ctesias, in the whole circle of antiquity, vol. xx. p. 84. edit. 1747. See also vol. iv. p. 265.

in

in such vague and general terms, as do not, by any means, ascertain the time of that event.

Herodotus says expressly, "In the FOURTH year after the battle at Marathon, when Darius had assembled the best of his forces, in order to invade Greece, the Egyptians, who had been subdued by Cambyses, revolted from the Persians *." And a little afterwards, he adds, "Darius died the year after the revolt of Egypt †:" that is, inclusively, the FIFTH year after the battle at Marathon, or the year bef. Chr. 486. Other authors corroborate the testimony of Herodotus ‡:

Diodorus Siculus informs us, that Xerxes, the son and successor of Darius, was assassinated in the fourth year of the LXXVIII Olympiad, bef. Chr. 465 years. This prince reigned 21 years ‖: consequently his father must have died in the year 486.

Sir

* Τεταρτῳ ετει, quarto anno Ægyptii defecerunt. Herod. l. vii. § 1.

† Τῳ ὑϛερῳ ετει, proximo anno ab Ægyptiorum defectione. Ibid. § 4.

‡ Several writers speak of the great preparations, which Darius had made for renewing the war. These must have taken up a considerable time.

Δαρειος, προ της τελευτης, παρασκευας πεποιημενος μεγαλων δυναμεων, Darius ante mortem magnarum copiarum apparatum fecerat. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 2.

Darius cùm bellum restauraret in ipso apparatu decedit. Just. l. ii. c. 10.

Darius ante QUADRIENNIUM quàm decederet, apud Marathonum pugnavit. Sulp. Sev. l. ii. c. 13.

Darius, cùm instauraret bellum, in ipso apparatu concidit, Olympiade septuagesimâ quartâ. Oros. l. ii. c. 8.—According to Orosius, Darius died bef. Chr. 484, six years after the battle of Marathon.

‖ Βασιλευσας των Περσων ετη πλειω των εικοσι, postquam ultra XX annos Persarum regno præfuisset. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 53.

 Ξερξης

Sir Isaac Newton observes, that "Darius began his reign in the spring, anno J. Per. 4193, bef. Chr. 521, and reigned THIRTY-SIX years, by the unanimous consent of all chronologers *."——"The reign of this prince," he says, "is determined by two eclipses of the moon, observed at Babylon, and recorded by Ptolemy; so that it cannot be disputed. The former was in the twentieth year of Darius, *an.* J. P. 4212, Nov. 19, at 11^h 45′ at night; the latter in the twenty-first year of the same prince, *an.* J. P. 4223, Apr. 25, at 11^h 30′ at night. Xerxes began his reign in the spring, *an.* J. P. 4229, bef. Chr. 485; for Darius died in the FIFTH year after the battle at Marathon, as Herodotus, l. vii. and Plutarch mention; and that battle was *an.* J. P. 4224, ten years before the battle at Salamis †."

Xerxes having determined to revenge the disgrace, received by his father at Marathon, spent four years in preparing for the invasion of Greece. In the FIFTH ‡ year he began his march, and passed the winter at Sardes. In the succeeding spring ||, bef. Chr. 480, he crossed the Hellespont, and brought his forces into Europe.

Ξερξης ετη κά, Xerxes ann. XXI. Maneth. apud Euseb. Chron. p. 17. & apud Syncell. p. 75, 76. Vid. p. 208.

* Βασιλευσαντα τα παντα ετεα ἑξ τε και τριηκοντα, sex et triginta annis regni expletis. Herod. l. vii. § 4.

Δαρειος ετη λϛ′, Darius ann. XXXVI. Maneth. apud Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 17. African. apud Syncell. p. 75. Vid. Syncell. p. 78. 208.

Ctesias pretends, that Darius obtained the kingdom of Persia at twelve years of age, and reigned twenty-one years. Ctesiæ Fragm. loc. cit.—But when the former of these numbers is so manifestly erroneous, what dependence can we place upon the latter?

† Newt. Observ. on Daniel. c. 10. p. 141.

‡ Πεμπτῳ δε ετεϊ ανιομενῳ, quinto autem anno ineunte. Herod. l. vii. § 20.

|| Αμα τῳ εαρι, ineunte vere. Herod. l. viii. § 37.

rope. He engaged Leonidas at Thermopylæ, about the beginning of the month Hecatombæon *, and arrived at Athens, about the end of the same month. On the twentieth of Boëdromion, the Greeks obtained the celebrated victory at Salamis.

According to this account, which is clearly stated by Herodotus, Xerxes employed FIVE years in his military preparations for the invasion of Greece. Justin and Orosius † agree with Herodotus in this particular. Eusebius likewise places the battle of Salamis in the FIFTH year of Xerxes ‡. Diodorus mentions a preparation of three years ‖; and if we add the time which Xerxes spent in subduing the Egyptians, his account will coincide with that of Herodotus.

In opposition to all these testimonies, the author of the Chronicle affirms, that Xerxes succeeded to the throne of Persia NINE years before the battle of Salamis.

EPOC. 51. The author places the birth of Euripides 486 years before the Christian æra.

Diogenes Laertius places it in the first year of the LXXV Olympiad, when Calliades was archon, bef. Chr. 480; and Thomas Magister, in the same Olympiad. Plutarch, Hesychius, Suidas, and others, likewise affirm,

* Vide Corsini Fast. Attic. tom. iii. p. 165. Herodotus says, "The barbarians spent a month in passing the Hellespont, and bringing their forces into Europe; and in three months more entered Attica, when Calliades was archon of the Athenians." Lib. viii. § 51.

† Xerxes bellum à patre cœptum adversus Greciam per quinquennium instruxit. Just. l. ii. c. 10. Per quinquennium instruxit. Oros. l. ii. c. 9.

‡ Euseb. Chron. p. 130.

‖ Τριετη χρονον παρασκευασαμενος. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 2.

that

that Euripides was born the very day, on which the Greeks defeated the Persians at Salamis *.

On the authority of these writers we may reasonably conclude, that there is a parachronism of five or six years, in this epocha.

Epoc. 54. In this epocha it is asserted, that Gelo became tyrant of Syracuse, two years AFTER the battle at Thermopylæ; whereas we are assured by the most eminent historians, that he had obtained the government of that city several years BEFORE Xerxes invaded Greece.

Diodorus informs us, that Gelo reigned SEVEN years, and DIED within two years after the battle abovementioned; that is, he became tyrant of Syracuse, in the year bef. Chr. 484, and died in 478 †. Aristotle likewise ascribes seven years to the tyranny of Gelo ‡. Pausanias relates, that Gelo was tyrant of Syracuse in the second year of the LXXII Olympiad, TEN years before the transit of Xerxes ‖. Though this writer seems to have mistaken Syracuse for Gela §, his testimony is totally repugnant to that of the Chronicle; for in another place, he positively asserts, that Gelo was tyrant of Syracuse, when Xerxes came into Europe ¶.

Diodorus, Ephorus, Herodotus, unanimously affirm, that the Greeks sent ambassadors to Gelo, as KING of

* Diog. Laert. in v. Socrat. l. ii. § 45.

Επι Καλλιου [lege Καλλιαδου] αρχοντος, κατα την πεμπτην και ἑβδομηκοστην Ολυμπιαδα. Th. Magist. in v. Eurip.

Plut. in Sympos. l. viii. c. 1. Hesychius Milesius de Viris claris, in v. Ευριπιδης. Suidas, &c.

† Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 30.

‡ Arist. Repub. l. v. c. 12.

‖ Pausan. l. vi. c. 9.

§ Vid. Dionys. Halic. l. vii. § 1.

¶ Pausan. l. viii. c. 42.

SYRACUSE,

Syracuse, to solicit his assistance against the Persians, when Xerxes was preparing for his intended expedition *.

It may be presumed, that Diodorus, a native of Sicily, was well acquainted with the records of his own country; and Herodotus, with the public transactions of his own time. It is certainly in the highest degree improbable, that Diodorus, Ephorus, and Herodotus, should be deceived, in a circumstance, which was rendered particularly remarkable by a formal embassy from the united states of Greece: for surely there must have been public records, and other authentic memorials, of this late and important transaction.

We may therefore conclude, that the author of the Chronicle has mistaken the time of Gelo's accession, for that of his decease, and placed the former under the archonship of Timosthenes, bef. Chr. 478. where he should have placed the latter. By this parachronism he has postponed the succession of Hiero to the year 472, which is six years later, than Diodorus and other historians have placed him †.

Epoc. 65. Here we are told, that the younger Cyrus ανεβ . . . when Callias was archon; i. e. in the third year of the XCIII Olympiad, bef. Chr. 406.

I can hardly suppose, that this passage refers to the visit, which Cyrus made his father in his last illness; or to his attempt to assassinate his brother at his coronation. It is scarcely probable, that the author of the Chronicle would record either of these unimportant circumstances, and say nothing of that memorable expe-

* Diod. Sic. l. xi. § 1. Ephor. apud Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. p. 175. Ω βασιλευ Συρηκουσιων, κ. τ. λ, Herod. l. vii. § 161.—Corsini places this embassy in the second year BEFORE the battle at Thermopylæ.

† Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 30.

dition,

dition, in which this young prince marched at the head of thirteen thousand Greeks, and a hundred thousand barbarians, to dispute the crown of Persia with Artaxerxes.

If these remaining letters ανβ . . . relate to this expedition, usually styled the Anabasis, here is a prochronism of FIVE years; for it commenced in the archonship of Exænetus or Xenænetus *, in the fourth year of the XCIV Olympiad, bef. Chr. 401, above five years after the date, specified in the Chronicle.

The LXVII epocha mentions only the RETURN of the ten thousand Greeks.

Upon a presumption, that the dates of these, or, at least, some of these events are carelessly and erroneously stated in the Chronicle, we may ask, Would a writer of reputation and learning, in one of the most polished and enlightened æras of ancient Greece, commit such mistakes, in opposition to the positive attestations of the most accurate historians, in events of PUBLIC NOTORIETY? Would a private citizen, or a magistrate of Paros, order a crude and inaccurate series of epochas to be engraved, at a great expence, and transmitted to posterity on a marble monument?—It is hardly probable.

* Ξενοφων αναβεβηκε συν Κυρῳ επι αρχοντος Ξεναινετου, Xenophon ascendit cum Cyro sub archonte Xenæneto. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 55. —Diodorus places the Anabasis under the same archon. l. xiv. p. 249. The learned author of a Dissertation, subjoined to Spelman's translation of Xenophon's Anabasis, is of opinion, that the year of the expedition was the third year of the XCIV Olympiad, bef. Chr. 402.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

VIII. THE discovery of the Chronicle is related in a very obscure and unsatisfactory manner, with some suspicious circumstances, and without any of those clear and unequivocal evidences, which always discriminate truth from falshood.

It is remarkable, that the place, where it was found, is not ascertained.

The generality of writers, who have had occasion to mention it, have supposed, that it was found in the island of Paros.

Thus Du Pin: "We have no monument, from which we can, with more certainty, fix the Attic æra, or the beginning of the reign of Cecrops, than the Chronicle, found in the isle of Paros *."

Du Fresnoy observes, that "the Parian Chronicle takes its name from the island of Paros, in the Archipelago, where it was found †."

Dr. Rawlinson, in a note to his translation of Du Fresnoy's Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire, affirms, "that these marbles were found in the island of Paros, one of the Cyclades ‡."

* Du Pin, Univ. Hist. Libr. tom. ii. l. i. p. 271.

† Elle tire son nom de l'isle de Paros, l'une de celles de l'Archipel, *où* cette Chronique fut *trouvée*, au commencement du XVII[e] siécle. Du Fresnoy, Tabl. Chron. tom. 1. p. clxvii. edit. 1744.

‡ New Method of studying History, vol. i. c. 2. § 3. p. 36.

Abbé Banier asserts, "that these marbles were dug up in the island of Paros *."

Others tell us, that they were not found at Paros, but in Asia Minor, at Smyrna.

Palmerius, who wrote a comment upon them, affirms, that "they were found at Smyrna, a celebrated city of Ionia †."

Petavius says expresfly, "they were DUG OUT of the ground at Smyrna ‡."

If we consult the editors of the Marmora Arundelliana, we shall find no satisfaction in this particular.

Selden, in commenting on the words εμ Παρω, in the second line, only says, "We may reasonably CONJECTURE, that the author was a Parian ‖;" but he does not once mention the place, where the Chronicle is supposed to have been found.

Prideaux is perfectly silent on this point.

Maittaire speaks of this fragment, as if he had not known where it was discovered. "Præterea," says he,

* CES MARBRES furent *déterrées* dans l'isle de Paros, & vendus au Comte d'Arondel. Banier, Mythol. tom. vi. p. 62. edit. Par. 1740.—This writer, and many others, suppose the Chronicle to have been written on a series of several pieces of marble. At present, there is only a shattered fragment remaining; but it is most probable, that the whole inscription was originally engraved on one tablet. Selden, who saw the greatest part of it, speaks of it in the singular number: epocharum marmor, chronologicum marmor, &c. edit. Ansa, p. iii. vid. supra, p. 53. *n.*

† Ea marmorum fragmenta inventa sunt Smyrnæ, quæ civitas erat inter Ionicas insignis. Palmer. Exercit. ad Chron. Marm. Arundel. p. 682.

‡ Antiquus ille chronologus, qui ex Arundellianis marmoribus, apud Smyrnam EFFOSSIS, nuper editus est. Petav. Rat. Temp. par. ii. l. ii. c. 9.

‖ Autorem hinc Parium fuisse, æquum est ut conjectemus. Seld. Marm. Arundel. p. 72.

"hoc

"hoc marmor Smyrnæ magis, quàm in ULLA ALIA Asiæ parte, inventum fuisse, NON LIQUET *."

Dr. Chandler BELIEVES it was found at Paros, and afterwards removed to Smyrna. "Marmor Chronicon, in insulâ Paro, UT FAS SIT CREDERE, repertum, dein ad Smyrnam translatum †."

This is the last account we have of the Parian inscription.

On these evidences we may observe, that neither Du Pin, Du Freshoy, Banier, Palmerius, nor Petavius, appear to have received any certain information, relative to the place, where the Chronicle was discovered; at least, they are not consistent in their accounts; and yet, as we shall see hereafter, it was purchased at Smyrna by one of their countrymen.

Selden's ÆQUUM EST UT CONJECTEMUS, Maittaire's NON LIQUET, and Chandler's UT FAS SIT CREDERE, leave us totally in the dark.

In the inscription itself we have no data, by which we can any ways discover the place, where the marble was erected.

Palmerius conceives, that the author or the stonecutter was an Ionian. Ἑως, he says, is the Ionian dialect for ἑως, εμ Παρω for εν Παρω, and εγ Λυκωρειας for εκ Λυκωρειας ‡.

But Maittaire observes, that ειως is the poetic dialect, frequently used by Homer ‖; that εμ and εγ are mere archaïsms, very common in ancient inscriptions §; and that,

* Maitt. Marm. Arund. p. 571.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. p. x.

‡ Palmer. Exercit. ad Chron. p. 682.

‖ Ειως is used for εως, Il. iii. 291. xi. 342. 488. xii. 141, & alibi passim.

§ Hunc chronographum fuisse Ionem, ut credam, minimè inducar, quòd εμ Παρω pro εν Παρω, et εγ Λυκωρειας pro εκ Λυκωρειας, scripserit;

that, from such expressions as these we cannot infer, that the Chronicle was composed at Smyrna.

If this monument was erected in that city, for what purpose does the writer mention Astyanax, the archon of Paros, and not one circumstance relative to Smyrna?

If it was erected at Paros, why does he not mention more archons of that city than one? Or how shall we account for his profound silence, with respect to all the events and revolutions, which must have happened in that island, and have been infinitely more interesting to the natives, than the transactions of any foreign country?

Sir Thomas Roe, who was ambassador at Constantinople, and whose letters, from the year 1621 to 1628, inclusive, are published under the title of NEGOTIATIONS, corresponded with lord Arundel on the subject of ancient manuscripts, coins, statues, and inscriptions; and, at the same time, recommended and assisted Mr. Petty, whom the earl had sent into Asia for the purpose of collecting antiquities; yet in his letters to his lordship, relative to the discoveries made by Mr. Petty, he does not once mention the Parian Chronicle.

In a letter to lord Arundel, dated, Constantinople, Jan. 20—30, 1624, Sir Thomas acknowledges the receipt of three letters from his lordship, in recommendation of Mr. Petty, sent by the earl in search of antiquities. He informs him, that he doubts he will find little worthy of his pains in those rude parts, "where barbarism has trodden out all worthy reliques of antiquity;" that he may find some few medals or coins; but that books have been so often visited, that Duck-lane is better furnished than the Greek church; that Mr. Marsham, by his assistance, had ransacked the country

ferit; quippe hæc magis ad archaïsmum, quàm ad Ionismum spectant. . . . Nisi fallor, ει pro ε, et ου pro ο, poetarum magis propria sunt, quamvis hæc usurpent frequentissimè etiam Iones. Maitt. Marm. Arund. p. 571. 615. 638.

for

for statues, columns, and antique works; that he had lately fallen into a way of meeting with some rare statues from Alexandria, by means of the patriarch, particularly of a negro of black marble, a piece not to be matched; that the said patriarch has given him for his majesty, with express promise to deliver it, "an autographal Bible entire, written by the hand of Tecla, the protomartyr of the Greekes, who lived in the time of St. Paul; and he doth averr that to bee true and authenticall, of his owne writing, and the greatest antiquitye of the Greeke church *."

* Negot. let. 241. p. 334.——This was the famous Alexandrian MS.

In a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, dated Feb. 17—27, 1626, Sir Thomas speaks of it in the following terms: "The patriarch also, this new yeare's tyde, sent mee the old Bible, formerly presented to his late majestie; which hee hath now dedicated to the kyng, and will send with that an epistle, as I thincke he hath signifyed to your grace, at least I will presume to mention it to his majestie. What estimation it may be of, is above my sckill; but he valewes that as the greatest antiquitye of the Greek church. The lettre is very fayre, a character that I have neuer seene. It is entyre, except the beginning of St. Matheiw. He doth testefye under his hand, that it was written by the virgin Tecla, daughter of a famous Greeke called Αβγιεριενος (stella matutina) who founded the monestarye in Egypt vpon Pharoas tower, a deuout and learned mayd, who was persecuted in Asya, and to whom Gregorye Nazianzen hath written many epistteles. At the end wherof, vnder the same hand, are the epistteles of Clement. She dyed not long after the councell of Nice. The booke is very great, and hath antiquitye enough at sight. I doubt not his majestie will esteeme it for the hand by whom it is presented." let. 448. p. 618.

Who, in the name of wonder, was this famous Greek, called Abgierienos?

The patriarch wanted to magnify the importance of his present when he talked in this manner!—The council of Nice was held in 325. Gregory Nazianzen flourished about the year 370. But lord Arundel was told, that the devout and learned writer lived in the time of St. Paul!—One story is as credible as the other.

In

+ The person meant was Paul the Egyptian saint, called the first hermit, who died about [illegible] 360, not the Apostle Paul.

In the next letter to lord Arundel, dated Oct. 20—30, 1625, he says, "Mr. Petty hath visited Pergamo, Samos, Ephesus, and some other places, where hee hath made your lordship greate prouisions, though hee lately wrote to mee, hee had found nothing of worth *."

In a subsequent letter to the earl, dated, Mar. 28, 1626, O. S. he says: "My last letters brought your lordship the advice of Mr. Pettye's shipwracke, and losses vpon the coast of Asya, returning from Samos . . . Although hee will not boast to mee, yett I am informed, hee hath gotten many things rare and ancient. There was neuer man so fitted to an employment, that encounters all accidents with so vnwearied patience; eates with Greekes on their worst dayes; lies with fishermen on plancks, at the best; is all things to all men, that hee may obteyne his ends, which are your lordship's service. Hee is gone to Athens, whither also I have sent †."

This is the last letter, in the Collection, from Sir Thomas Roe to lord Arundel.

In a letter to the duke of Buckingham, dated, Constantinople, Nov. 5—15, 1626, he says: "Mr. Petty hath raked together 200 pieces, all broken, or few entyre; what they will proye I cannot judge. Hee had this advantage, that hee went himselfe into all the islands, and tooke all hee saw; and is now gone to Athens, where I haue had an agent nine monethes ‡."

In another letter to the duke of Buckingham, dated, Apr. 15, 1628, Sir Thomas gives his grace but a very indifferent idea of Mr. Petty's collections.

"I could haue LADEN SHIPPS with such stones as Mr. Petty diggs; but GOOD THINGS undefaced are

* Negot. let. 315. p. 444.

† Negot. let. 418. p. 570.

‡ Negot. let. 359. p. 495.

rare,

rare, or rather NOT to be FOUND. Our ſearch hath made many poore men INDUSTRIOUS to rippe up old ruines *."

Theſe are moſt probably the real ſentiments of Sir Thomas Roe, with reſpect to Mr. Petty's diſcoveries, which he would ſcarcely have expreſſed with ſo much freedom to lord Arundel.

Mr. Petty's name is mentioned in ſeveral other letters; but there is not, in any of them, the leaſt intimation of the Parian Chronicle; which is a remarkable circumſtance. For, ſuppoſing it to be authentic, it was a moſt valuable monument of ancient learning; and muſt ſurely have occaſioned much converſation at Smyrna, and other places in that country; more eſpecially as we ſhall find, that it had been EXPOSED TO SALE, before it fell into the hands of Mr. Petty.

Gaſſendus, in his Life of M. de Peireſc †, gives us the following account of its firſt diſcovery.

"Per idem tempus accepit [Peireſcius] aureum eruditi Seldeni librum, de Arundellianis Marmoribus, ſive ſaxis Græcè inciſis, quæ perilluſtris ille comes transferri ex Aſiâ in Angliam, hortóſque ſuos, curaverat. Ac memorare quidem par eſt, marmora illa fuiſſe primùm operâ Peireſkii detecta, erutaque, perſolutis aureis quinquaginta, per Samſonem quendam, ipſius negotia Smyrnæ procurantem; & convehenda cum jam eſſent, neſcio quâ venditorum arte, Samſonem conjectum in carcerem fuiſſe, marmoraque ipſa interea diſtracta. Sed et illud addendum eſt, maximoperè lætatum Peireſkium, cùm accepit, præclaras illas antiquitatis reliquias in

* Negot. let. 611. p. 808.

† Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peireſc, counſellor in the parliament of Provence, was an eminent patron of arts and learning, and correſponded with almoſt all the literati of his time. He died at Aix in 1637, in the fifty-ſeventh year of his age.

tanti herois incidisse manus; ac tantò magis, quantò agnovit, Seldenem, veterem amicum, eas feliciter illustrâsse.

"Scilicet, cui unicus scopus utilitas publica fuit, nihil putavit interesse, seu sua esset gloria, seu alterius, dummodò quod esset è reipublicæ literariæ bono prodiret in lucem. Existimavit autem, thesaurum incomparabilem contineri in illis, præsertim rerum Græcarum epochis, quæ non modò historicum, sed fabulosum etiam tempus summè illustrant, conciliántque; dum memorabilia omnia, ab annis usque octingentis ante Olympiadas, ad usque quingentos quinquaginta post earum initium, describunt*."

"About this time [sometime in the year 1629] Pieresc received the learned Selden's valuable commentary on the Arundel Marbles, or certain stones, with Greek inscriptions engraved upon them, which had been conveyed out of Asia into England, by the direction of the illustrious earl of Arundel, and placed in his gardens. These marbles, I must observe, were first discovered, and dug out of the ground, in consequence of the application and order of Peiresc, who paid fifty pieces of gold † for that purpose, by the hands of one Samson, his agent at Smyrna. But when they were ready to be sent on board, by some artifice of the venders, Samson was thrown into prison, and the marbles, in the mean time, left in a state of confusion. I must likewise add, that Peiresc was extremely pleased, when he was informed, that these celebrated reliques of antiquity had fallen into the hands of such an eminent personage, as lord Arundel; and more particularly, when he found, that they had been happily illustrated by his old friend Selden.

* Gassend. de Vitâ Peirescii, lib. iv. an. 1629.

† It is perhaps not easy to ascertain the value of the *aurei quinquaginta*.

"As

"As a citizen of the world, whose only view was the benefit of mankind, Peiresc thought it immaterial, whether he himself, or another, received the glory, provided any thing could be brought to light, which might contribute to the advantage of the republic of letters. He was of opinion, that an incomparable treasure is contained in these Grecian epochas, which not only give a clear and consistent account of the dates of some important transactions, in the historic times, but of others also, in the fabulous and heroic ages; while they describe every memorable occurrence for 800 years before the Olympiads, and for 550 * after their commencement."

Several circumstances in this narrative are worthy of observation.

1. There is something very singular and unusual in the conduct of Peiresc, on the loss of this inscription, after he had purchased it for a considerable sum. His agent, it seems, was committed to prison, and the marbles were *distracta*, broken, separated, and thrown about in confusion.

It would have been natural for an ordinary virtuoso, who had received information of such a CURIOSITY, to have exerted all his activity and interest, in order to procure it. But Peiresc, a rich and indefatigable collector †, a philosopher, and an eminent patron of learning,

* The calculation of Gassendus in this place is erroneous. The epocha of Cecrops is bef. Chr. 1582. The Olympiads commenced an. 776, 806 years afterwards. The last remaining epocha on the marbles is 354; the date of the inscription 264. If we bring down our reckoning to the latter, the number of years after the Olympiads is 512; if to the former, it is only 422, instead of 550, as Gassendus has computed.

† M. Goguet, having occasion to mention M. de Peiresc, says, "Nothing escaped him, that could any way contribute to the advancement

ing, does not, as far as we can perceive, make the least effort to recover this inscription; notwithstanding it was apparently of much greater value, than any other marble monument in the universe. On the contrary, he loses the money he had advanced, chearfully resigns his claim, and is glad to find the marbles were preserved in a foreign country.

His composure, on this occasion, would lead us to imagine, that he entertained some SECRET suspicion, relative to the authenticity of the inscription.

2. Peiresc, we are told, paid for these marbles *aureos quinquaginta*, "fifty pieces of gold." What lord Arundel paid for them we are not informed. Prideaux tells us, they were redeemed by Mr. Petty, majori pretio *, "at a greater price;" and Dr. Chandler says, pretio LONGE majori †, "for a far greater sum."

Supposing then, that Mr. Petty paid only thrice as much, as Peiresc had paid before, the owners or the venders received 200 pieces for the marbles. This, I apprehend, was an extraordinary acquisition, amply sufficient for the gratification of the author and the stone-cutter, especially at Smyrna, in the earlier part of the last century. It was certainly as powerful a motive, in conjunction with others, which we do not know, as those which actuated either Annius of Viterbo, or any of his brethren, in the fabrication of inscriptions.

3. The sum, which was paid for these marbles, was much greater, than what a writer at Paros, 264 years before the birth of Christ, could possibly expect; and affords, as far as profit alone is concerned, a sufficient

vancement of human knowledge; and he spared no pains for that purpose. Goguet's Orig. of Laws, vol. iii. Differt. 1. p. 251. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 5. § 7. p. 397.

* Prid. Marm. Oxon. pref. p. ix.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. p. ii.

answer

anſwer to the queſtion, What advantage could any man propoſe, by the fabrication of the inſcription, adequate to the trouble and expence, attending the execution of this project?

4. It is certain, that Peireſc was never in Aſia; that he truſted to the integrity of his agent at Smyrna; and conſequently was very liable to be impoſed on in this negotiation. On the one ſide or the other, there was evidently ſome craft or impoſition. Who Samſon was, we are not informed: probably he was a JEW. He was however thrown into priſon. This gives us no favourable opinion of his integrity. Gaſſendus indeed ſays, he was confined, *venditorum arte*, "by the iniquitous contrivance of the venders." If Samſon was guilty of no fraud, the people, who ſold the marbles, ſeem to have been capable of executing any ſcheme, which might gratify their avarice. For after they had received a conſiderable ſum from Peireſc, they impriſoned his agent, and ſold them a ſecond time to Mr. Petty.

Such were the firſt OSTENSIBLE POSSESSORS of theſe marbles! and ſo dark and unſatisfactory is the account, which is tranſmitted to us of their diſcovery! They had been totally unknown, or unnoticed for almoſt nineteen hundred years, and, at laſt, they are dug out of the ground—no body can tell us WHEN or WHERE!

It will probably be objected, that the mutilated ſtate of the marbles, when they were firſt brought to England, and examined by Selden, is a proof of their authenticity, as it cannot be ſuppoſed, that any man, in his ſenſes, would deface his own inſcription.

In anſwer to this objection we may obſerve, that the Chronicle may be a modern compilation, and yet not have come immediately from the hands of the original

 fabricator.

fabricator. It might have been ACCIDENTALLY defaced, before it was purchased for M. Peiresc.

We are informed, that after Samson was imprisoned, the marbles were broken, separated, and thrown about promiscuously at Smyrna. This will sufficiently account for their mutilation.

But, secondly, some occasional lacunæ might have been artfully contrived, to conceal false assertions and chronological errors; and, at the same time, to give the marbles a venerable air of antiquity, which was not sufficiently conspicuous in the Greek characters. This artifice has been frequently practised. We shall see a remarkable instance of it in the XVI chapter, where this account is given of one H. Cajadus: "Lapides, datâ operâ detruncatos, ut aliqua inessent ANTIQUITATIS VESTIGIA, obrui præcepit."

It is well known, that a true antiquary values a fragment, as much as a perfect piece; and his gusto is perhaps more stimulated by the idea of what is lost, than gratified by the part, which is preserved.

The story of the Sibyl, who appeared to Tarquin, the last king of Rome, is not inapplicable on this occasion.

A woman in strange attire came to Tarquin, and offered to sell him a collection of prophecies in nine volumes, for three hundred pieces of gold *. Upon his refusing to buy them on these extraordinary terms, the woman threw three of them into the fire, and asked the same price for the remaining six. Tarquin, looking upon her as a mad woman, treated her with contempt. Upon which she burnt three volumes more, and still

* We are told by Varro, and by Lactantius, who relates the story after him, and likewise by Servius, that the woman demanded three hundred philippi. This anticipation is a little absurd: such a coin did not exist, till the time of king Philip, the father of Alexander the Great.

persisted

persisted in demanding as much for these three, as she had done for the whole collection.

The old woman formed a proper notion of human nature. Tarquin's CURIOSITY was immediately excited; and the fragments were purchased at the price she demanded *.

* A. Gell. l. i. 19. Dion. Halic. l. iv. c. 8. p. 259. Plin. l. xiii. 13. Serv. Æn. vi. 72. Varro and Lactantius report the story of Tarquinius Priscus. Fragm. p. 35. Lact. l. i. c. 6.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

IX. THE world has been often imposed upon by spurious books and inscriptions.

Bishop Stillingfleet, having occasion to question the authenticity of a book, entitled, Scotorum Antiquitates, ascribed by Hector Boethius to one Veremundus, a Spaniard *, makes the following remarks, which are applicable to the present subject.

" It is well known, that it was no unusual thing in that age [about the beginning of the sixteenth century] to publish books under the names of ancient authors ... For, about that time, men began to be inquisitive into matters of antiquity; and therefore some, who had more learning, and better inventions than others, set themselves to work, to gratify the curiosity of those, who longed to see something of the antiquities of their own country. And such things were so eagerly and implicitly received by less judicious persons, that it proved no easy matter to convince them of the imposture †."

The celebrated Dr. Bentley makes the following observations to the same effect.

" To forge and counterfeit books, and father them upon great names, has been a practice almost as old as letters. But it was then most of all in fashion, when the

* Veremundus is said to have lived about the year 1090. Fabric. Bibl. Med. & Inf. Lat. Hector Boethius flourished in 1526. Gesner. Or, in 1510. König. Bibl.

† Stillingfleet, Orig. Brit. pref. p. 50.

the kings of Pergamus and Alexandria *, rivaling one another in the magnificence and copiousness of their libraries, gave great rates for any treatises, that carried the names of celebrated authors; which was an invitation to the scribes and copiers of those times, to enhance the price of their wares, by ascribing them to men of fame and reputation; and to suppress the true names, that would have yielded less money. And now and then even an author, who wrote for bread, and made a traffic of his labours, would purposely conceal himself, and personate some old writer of eminent note; giving the title and credit of his works to the dead, that he himself might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for lucre, was afterwards done out of glory and affectation, as an exercise of style, and an ostentation of wit. In this the tribe of the sophists are principally concerned; in whose schools it was the ordinary task to compose Ηθοποιΐας †, to make speeches, and write letters in the name and character of some hero, or great commander, or philosopher: Τινας αν ειποι λογους, "What would Achilles, Medea, or Alexander, say in such or such circumstances?" Thus Ovid, we see, who was bred up in that way, wrote love-letters in the names of Penelope, and the rest. It is true, they came abroad under his own name; because they were written in Latin and in verse, and so had no colour or pretence to be the originals of the Grecian ladies. But some of the Greek sophists had the success

* Galen. in Hippoc. de Naturâ Hominis, com. ii. p. 17. edit. Basil.

† Allocutio, quæ à Græcis ηθοποιΐα dicitur, est imitatio sermonis ad mores et suppositas personas accommodata: ut, quibus verbis uti potuisset Andromache, Hectore mortuo. Priscian. See the Ethopœiæ of Severus the sophist, at the end of the Rhetores Selecti, published by Gale.

and satisfaction to see their essays, in that kind, pass with some readers for the genuine works of those, they endeavoured to express. This, no doubt, was great content and joy to them; being as full a testimony of their skill in imitation, as the birds gave to the painter, when they pecked at his grapes. One of them * indeed has dealt ingenuously, and confessed, that he feigned the answers to Brutus, only as a trial of skill; but most of them took the other way, and concealing their own names, put off their copies for originals; preferring that silent pride and fraudulent pleasure, though it was to die with them, before an honest commendation from posterity for being good imitators. And to speak freely, the greatest part of mankind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great an invitation to put the trick upon them †."

If we were to take a general view of the republic of letters, we should be astonished at the number of supposititious books, which have been imposed upon the world by knaves and cheats.

Jamblicus, on the testimony of Seleucus, informs us, that Hermes Trismegistus was the author of 20,000 books; and, on the authority of Manetho, 36,525 ‡.

* Mithridates.—The publication, to which Dr. Bentley alludes, consists of 35 epistles, supposed to have been written by M. Brutus; and the same number of answers, with a preface, by Mithridates, to king Mithridates his cousin.—Epistolæ, quas nobis reliquit nescio quis, Bruti nomine, nomine Phalaridis, nomine Senecæ et Pauli, quid aliud censeri possunt, quàm DECLAMATIUNCULÆ? Erasm. Ep. l. i. 1. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 10. vol. i. p. 414.

† Bent. Dissert. upon Phal. p. 6. edit. 1777.

‡ Jamb. de Myst. sect. viii. c. 1.—Julius Firmicus also ascribes 20,000 volumes to Hermes. Mercurius Ægyptius conscripserat viginti millia voluminum de variis substantiis & principiis, & potestatum ordinibus cœlestium. Mathes. l. ii.

There

There are many volumes now extant under his name; but not one of them is genuine. Two of the moſt conſiderable, the Pœmander, and the dialogue entitled Aſclepius, are metaphyſical rhapſodies, containing a medley of Chriſtian, Platonic, and Egyptian doctrines, without either taſte or conſiſtency; and appear to have been written ſince the commencement of Chriſtianity *.

Twenty or thirty thouſand books, produced by one author! The very idea ſhocks all human credibility; and, if ever ſuch a number really exiſted, under the name of Hermes, we may fairly conclude, that the greateſt part of them were forgeries †.

The two books of Egyptian hieroglyphics, which are aſcribed to Horus Apollo, or Horapollo, and ſaid to have been tranſlated out of the Egyptian language into Greek by one Philippus, are the ſpurious production of ſome Greek ſophiſt.

An epic poem, called the Argonautics, eighty-ſix

* Caſaubon calls the Pœmander, ſemichriſtiani merum figmentum, and gives ſufficient reaſons for his opinion. Exercit. in Baron. Annal. num. 18. p. 55. Stillingfl. Orig. Sacræ, b. ii. c. 2. Aſclepius is in the ſame ſtyle, and ſeems to be a production of the ſame brain.

† Patricius aſſigns ſome very probable reaſons for the aſcription of all theſe books to Hermes.—Quòd fuerit, ſays he, in more antiquiſſimorum hominum, ut ſi cui libro authoritatem accedere cuperent, vel Dei alicujus, ut Ægyptii Mercurii, vel hominis alicujus inſignis, nomine ornarent, reverentiâ ſcilicet quâdam; vel etiam quòd vendibiliorem eo nomine ſperarent fore; vel quòd fœtui proprio, alieni nominis quàm ſui inſignibus, gratiam majorem conſequi ſperarent ac immortalitatem; vel poſtremò, quòd reverà author libri ignoraretur, viderentúrque in eo contenta dogmata non niſi magni viri eſſe; aut etiam negligentiâ quadam, ac nullâ librorum expenſione, alicujus eos viri celebris nomine inſigniverunt. Patric. Diſcuſſ. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29. Vid Galen. de Simpl. Medic. Facul. l. vi.

hymns, and other pieces, pass under the name of Orpheus, the celebrated Thracian, who lived at the time of the Argonautic expedition *. But they are evidently supposititious. As the ancients have told us, that Orpheus could make wild beasts, trees, rocks, and rivers listen to his music, it is no wonder, that certain poets in later ages assumed his character, and sent their productions into the world under his auspices. His name was an incomparable passport and recommendation to the writings of obscure bards. Aristotle asserted, that no such poet as Orpheus ever existed: "Orpheum poetam docet Aristoteles nunquam fuisse †." Cicero seems to agree with Aristotle; and Vossius, Huetius, and others, maintain the same opinion ‡.

But, without calling his existence in question, we may be fully assured, that none of his works are now remaining.

* Suidas says, a little extravagantly, that Orpheus lived "eleven generations before the Trojan war." But who shall pretend to ascertain the age of a poet, who is said to have been the son of Apollo and Calliope, and to have gone down to the regions of Pluto to fetch his wife? Saxius places him 1255 years bef. Christ.

† Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. i, § 107.

‡ Puto enim, triumviros illos poëseos, Orphea, Musæum, Linum, non fuisse; sed esse nomina ab antiquâ Phœnicum linguâ, quâ usi Cadmus et aliquamdiu posteri. Voss. de Art. Poet. c. 13. p. 78. Huet. Dem. Evang. prop. iv. c. 8. § 19. p. 184. edit. 1680.——Vid. Suid. in v. Ορφευς, "where," says Dr. Bentley, "there is an account of half a score of such counterfeit writers." Dissert. on Phal. p. 10, Ælian. Var. Hist. l. viii. c. 6. Diog. Laert. in procem. § 5. Pliny places Orpheus in the list of magicians. Nat. Hist. l. xxx. c. 1.

Some writers pretend, that the Argonautics, the hymns, and other poetical pieces, which are extant under the name of Orpheus, are the works of Onomacritus, who lived about 520 years before the Christian æra.——This notion may be as groundless, as the other.

Musæus

Musæus is said to have been the son, or the disciple of Orpheus *. The poem of Hero and Leander, which is published under his name, is probably the work of some Greek poet in the fifth or sixth century †. It is observed, that he has borrowed very largely from the Dionysiaca of Nonnus ‡. We often meet with the name of Musæus; but never find the least intimation of this poem, in any ancient writer. Tzetzes, I believe, is the first, who expressly mentions it ||. It was first printed in 1486.

We have a history, De Excidio Trojæ, of the Destruction of Troy, under the name of Dares Phrygius. In an epistle prefixed, it is pretended, that this Dares was present at the siege; that his manuscript was discovered at Athens many years afterwards, by C. Nepos, and translated by him into Latin.

* Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 232. Suidas.

† Musæum hunc recentiorem circumcirca tempora Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Joannis Gazæi, Nonni, Christodori, Leonis Magistri, multis scilicet post Christum natum annis, floruisse certissimum est, præter orationis structuram, ipso operis titulo, ubi se grammaticum appellat, Μουσαιου του γραμματικου τα καθ' Ἡρω και Λεανδρον; et istiusmodi inscriptionem in pluribus me legisse memini manuscriptis codicibus. Allat. de Patriâ Homeri, c. 4. p. 75.

An quæso, nisi monitus criticorum vaticiniis, Musæo, Orpheo, Lino, Phocylidi, et aliis INNUMERIS, tum Pelasgis, tum Romanis, poemata spuria multa, et illegitima, assignata fuisse, hodiéque assignari INSULSE, ut veteri Phocylidi quæ supersunt, Musæo de Herone et Leandro poema, scire quis unquam potuisset? Maussaci Dissert. Crit. de Harpocratione, p. 399. edit. 1683.

If we may depend on the authority of Josephus and Sextus Empiricus, there were no writings remaining, in their days, among the Greeks, of higher antiquity, than the poems of Homer. See notes to chap. ix. p. 127.

‡ Paræus in Musæum.

|| Tzet. Chil. ii. hist. 38. v. 435.—Tzetzes flourished about the year 1176.

But

But the inelegant, not to say, the despicable style, in which it is written, as well as many other circumstances, clearly demonstrate the falsity of these pretences.

There is another production of the same character, in six books, De Bello Trojano, of the Trojan War, bearing the name of Dictys Cretensis. In the preface, and an epistle, which accompanies this work, it is asserted, that the author attended Idomeneus to the siege of Troy, and wrote the history of that expedition in the Greek language, but in Phœnician characters; that his work was buried with him at his own request, in a coffer made of pewter or tin; that, in consequence of an earthquake, the coffer was discovered, in the reign of Nero; and some time afterwards translated into Latin, by one Q. Septimius Romanus.

This legendary tale, and some others, which I shall have occasion to mention, are evidently formed upon the old story of king Numa *, who is said to have ordered, that his books should be safely enclosed in a stone chest, and buried by his side. After they had lain in the ground 490 years †, they were, it seems, accidentally discovered, and appeared as fresh, as if they had been newly written ‡! Some people imagined, they were kept in this EXCELLENT PRESERVATION by a miracle ||. Others probably, a little more sagacious than the rest, upon observing the Egyptian papyrus, of which

* Varro Fragm. p. 51. Liv. l. xl. c. 29. Plin. l. xiii. c. 13. Plut. v. Numæ, p. 74. Val. Max. l. i. c. i. § 12. Lactan. l. i. c. 22. Aur. Vict. c. 3.

† Numa died, bef. Chr. 671; and his books were found in the year 181. Corsin. Plin. loc. cit.

‡ Non integros modò, sed recentissimâ specie. Liv. loc. cit.

|| Majore miraculo, quòd tot infossi duraverint annis. Plin. loc. cit.

they were made, the freshness of the writing, and the contents, looked upon them as forgeries. It is however agreed on all hands, that Q. Petilius, the prætor, by a decree of the senate, caused them to be publicly burnt; which certainly would not have been suffered, if there had been any reason to believe, they were the genuine remains of the religious Numa *.

A small volume, containing 148 epistles, has been repeatedly published under the name and character of Phalaris, tyrant of Agrigentum. In the year 1695, the Hon. Mr. Boyle printed a new edition of these Epistles, which occasioned a memorable controversy between him and Dr. Bentley. The latter, in a Dissertation †, well known to the learned, considers the chronology, the language, the contents, and the first appearance of these epistles; and incontestably proves, that they are the spurious productions of some sophist, who lived in a much later age, than the real Phalaris. To this Dissertation, the learned author has subjoined some critical remarks on the Epistles of Themistocles ‡, Socrates, and Euripides; and on Æsop's Fables, shewing, that they are likewise supposititious.

* Inclyta justitia religióque Numæ Pompilii erant. Liv. l. i. c. 18.

† Bentley's Dissertation was printed at the end of the second edition of Mr. Wotton's Reflections on ancient and modern Learning, in 1697. The Examination of Bentley's Dissertation, by the Hon. Mr. Boyle, appeared about nine months afterwards; and a second edition of it, before the end of the year 1698. This drew from Dr. Bentley another edition of his Dissertation, in 1699, with a preface, and very large additions, in answer to the examiner.

‡ The very judicious and accurate Corsini deduces a new argument against the authenticity of the epistles, ascribed to Themistocles, from a mistake, which the author has made in the thirteenth epistle, concerning the Corinthian month Panemus. Fast. Attic. Dissert. iii. § 22.

Some

Some of the dialogues, which are published among the works of Plato, were written by other authors. Erasmus thinks, this is so very evident, that he, who does not perceive it, must have no discernment *.

Diogenes Laertius observes, that the dialogues, entitled, Eryxias, Acephalus or Sisyphus, Axiochus, and Demodocus, are undoubtedly spurious †. The Definitions, the Dialogue on Virtue, and that on Justice, are generally placed in the same class ‡. The Epinomis has been ascribed to Philippus Opuntius, one of Plato's disciples ‖; the second Alcibiades to Xenophon §, and Phædon to Panætius ¶.

* Sunt aliquot inter Platonicos dialogos, quos nemo non sentit suppositítios esse, nisi qui nihil omninò sentit animo. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5.

† Diog. Laert. l. iii. c. 62.

Eryxias is ascribed to Æschines, the Socratic philosopher. Suidas in v. Αισχινης.

Sisyphus or Acephalus, to Æschines. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 69. iii. § 62. Suid. loc. cit.

Axiochus to Æschines. Diog. Laert. Harpoc. in v. Αξιοχος. Suidas loc. cit. et in v. Αξιοχος.

Demodocus: ει δη του Πλατωνος το συγγραμμα, si modò est opus Platonis. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. p. 315.

‡ The Ὁροι, or Definitions, are supposed to have been written by Speusippus. Diog. Laert. l. iv. § 5. Lambecii Comment. de Biblioth. Cæsar. l. vii. p. 137.

The Dialogue on Virtue is placed by Suidas among the works of Æschines.

‖ Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 37.

§ Athen. l. xi. p. 506.

¶ Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 62. Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. ii. p. 9. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum. p. 511. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3.

*** In what relates to the want of authenticity, in some of Plato's Dialogues, and the works of others, I give the sentiments of learned writers, without any design to adopt or maintain their opinions, when they are not confirmed by unquestionable evidence.

Laertius

Laertius reckons up "near 400 books," which, he ſays, were undoubtedly written by Ariſtotle *. Patricius has collected the titles of 747, which have been aſcribed to that philoſopher †. But many of theſe pieces, as he has ſufficiently proved, are ſuppoſititious. Galen and Ammonius give us an anecdote, which accounts for this inundation of ſpurious publications, under the name of Ariſtotle.

"When the Attali and the Ptolemies," ſays Galen, "were rivaling one another in forming and enriching their reſpective libraries, the knavery of forging books and titles began [to be a common practice.] For, in order to get money, many artful ſchemers prefixed the names of celebrated authors to their manuſcripts, and, under ſuch fictitious characters, ſold them to thoſe princes ‡."

Ammonius relates the ſame ſtory. "It is reported," ſays he, "that Ptolemy Philadelphus, being deſirous of collecting the works of Ariſtotle, as indeed he was of collecting all ſorts of books, gave rewards to thoſe, who brought him any treatiſe of that philoſopher. Some therefore, with a deſign to make an advantage of his liberality, affixed the name of Ariſtotle to the compoſitions of other authors ‖."

On

* Ἃ τον αριθμον εγγυς ἡκει τετρακοσιων, quæ ad quadringentorum numerum ferè perveniunt. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 34.

† Si hi, ex variis authoribus, atque ipſo Ariſtotele, collecti, libri triginta ſeptem, reliquis à Laertio enumeratis, atque iis, qui extant, addantur, ſeptingentorum quadraginta ſeptem numerum adimplebunt. Patric. Diſcuſſ. Peripat. l. ii. p. 18.——The ſame books were probably mentioned by different authors, under different titles. This circumſtance ſeems to have deceived many writers, who have enumerated the works of the ancients.

‡ Galen. in Hippoc. de Nat. Hom. com. ii. p. 17.

‖ Πτολεμαιον τον Φιλαδελφον πανυ σπουδακεναι φασι περι τα Αριστοτελικα συγγραμματα,

On this account, it is almost impossible for us to know, which are the genuine productions of Aristotle.

The treatise on Elocution, usually ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus, though not unworthy of his character, is most probably the work of some other Demetrius, or some rhetorician of a later age, who has assumed his name *.

A hundred and thirty comedies were circulated at Rome, under the name of Plautus; but we are assured,

συγγραμματα, ὡς και περι τα λοιπα, και χρηματα διδοναι τοις προσφερουσιν αυτῳ βιβλους του φιλοσοφου· ὁθεν τινες χρηματιςασθαι βουλομενοι, επιγραφοντες συγγραμματα τῳ του φιλοσοφου ονοματι, προσηγον. Aiunt Ptolemæum Philadelphum incensum studio fuisse circa Aristotelis libros, sicuti et circa alios, et munera dedisse iis, qui sibi adferrent libros philosophi. Quare quidam ditari inde volentes, inscripserunt libros nomine philosophi, eique detulerunt. Ammon. Com. in Arist. Categ. p. 10.

* The scholiast on the Nubes of Aristophanes, quoting a passage in the treatise on Elocution, says, ὡς εφη Διονυσιος ὁ Ἁλικαρνασσευς εν τῳ περι Ἑρμηνειας: For this and other reasons, Valesius ascribes the treatise on Elocution to Dionysius Halicarnasseus. Valesii Excerpta, p. 65. Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. v. § 81. Hod. de Bibl. Text. l. i. c. 9. p. 55.

Vossius, Gale, &c. ascribe it to some other Demetrius. Auctor videtur alius Demetrius, rhetor Alexandrinus. Voss. Instit. Orat. l. vi. c. 2.——Tandem in sententiam Vossianam transivi. Gale præf. ad Rhet. Select.——Propendet animus ut credam, Demetrium Alexandrinum aureoli hujus libelli auctorem esse. Hudson. præf. ad Dionys. Halic.——Demetrii alicujus rhetoris libellus. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iv. c. 31. § 1. vol. iv. p. 424.——Demetrius was a very common name. Diogenes Laertius mentions twenty, and Fabricius above a hundred Demetrii. Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 390.

The editor of Daniel secundum LXX. contends, that the treatise on Elocution is really the work of the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus. Dissert. iv. § 15.

that

that Varro, an excellent judge in this case, included only twenty-one in the list of that author's works *.

Among the various pieces, which have been falsely ascribed to Cicero, the CONSOLATIO is the most remarkable. This tract made its first appearance in the year 1583, and is generally supposed to have been the work of Sigonius. "The essay de Consolatione," says Dr. Bentley, "as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last †." There is however an obvious and striking circumstance attending it, which alone seems to destroy all its pretensions to authenticity; and that is, the passages quoted by Lactantius ‡ from Cicero's real work, do not exist in the present Consolatio.

In the second century, we find the practice of forging books so very common, and so eagerly pursued, that it was impossible to guard against literary impositions ‖. We have a memorable instance of those fraudulent schemes in the case of Galen. That eminent physician having been the author of many volumes, not only on medical subjects, but on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric §, lest his reputation should be injured by spurious publications, gave the world a particular account of his

* A. Gell. l. iii. c. 3.

† Bentley, Differt. on Phal. p. 8.—See the opinions of several writers on this subject collected by Placcius, in his Theatrum Pseudonymorum, num. 646. p. 179—181.

‡ Lactan. l. iii. c. 14. 18. Vid. Lipsii Opera, tom. i. edit. Moreti, p. 411. Clerici Art. Crit. tom. ii. p. 333.

‖ Nemini non notum, quàm fertile et fœcundum scriptorum fictitiorum fuerit seculum secundum à Christo nato. Nihil magis tunc temporis in usu fuit, quàm libros emittere sub nominibus antiquiorum. Quod infinitis exemplis luculentò constat. Hodius, de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i. c. 9. p. 53.

§ Suidas in v. Γαληνος.

writings *. Yet, notwithstanding this precaution, above forty books were fathered upon him, which are not included in his catalogue †.

In this manner a multitude of spurious productions have been published under the names of Homer, Æsop, Euripides, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Lysias ‡, Demosthenes, Plutarch, Lucian, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Quintilian, and almost every other eminent author of Greece and Rome ‖.

The forgeries of Annius Viterbiensis are well known. In the year 1497, this impudent monk published a volume, containing, as he pretended, the Antiquities of Berosus in five books; one book of Manetho's Supplement to Berosus; one book of Xenophon's Æquivoca; two books of Fabius Pictor on the Golden Age, and the Origin of Rome; one book of Myrsilus Lesbius on the Pelasgic War; one book of Cato's Origines; one book of an Itinerary by Antoninus Pius; one book of C. Sempronius, on the Division of Italy; a chronological tract by Archilochus; one book of Metasthenes § on the Assyrian and Persian Annals; an

* Περι των ιδιων βιβλιων, Of his own books.

† Galeno, quanquam de libris suis librum edidisset, quo testatum relinqueret, quinam à se conscripti libri essent, sunt tamen reperti homines audaculi, qui illi, præter à se nominatos ascripserunt libros plusquam quadraginta. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29.

‡ Harpocration, in his excellent Lexicon on the Ten Orators of Greece, when he mentions any oration of Lysias, or of others, the authenticity of which is not sufficiently ascertained, usually subjoins the words, ει γνησιος, "if it be genuine." And this useful caution he repeats, on many occasions, in the course of his references. v. p. 11. 13. 16. 17. 22. 23. & alibi passim.

‖ Vid. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum.

§ Ita eum ineptè vocat, qui est Megasthenes. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 8. p. 609.

Epitome

Epitome of History by Philo in one book; a tract of Marius Aretius on the Situation of Sicily; and a Dialogue, containing a description of Spain, by the same author *.

These fragments were illustrated by the comments of Annius himself; and for some years passed for the genuine works of the authors, whose names they bear. They are now universally exploded, as the fictions of the editor.

The learned Dr. Prideaux, having occasion to mention the forgeries of Annius, the British History of Geoffrey of Monmouth †, and other productions of the same stamp, subjoins this reflection: "All these are no other than the fictions of the first editors. They framed them to perpetuate their names by the publication; and they have truly done so, for they are still remembered for it; but no otherwise, than under the style of INFAMOUS IMPOSTORS ‡."

It is remarkable, that no province of literature has been so grievously infested with cheats and forgers,

* Berosi, sacerdotis Chaldaici antiquitatum libri quinque, &c. Romæ, 1497. folio. This collection was afterwards printed at Venice, Paris, Basil, Antwerp, and other places.

† Geoffrey of Monmouth lived in the time of Henry the First and Stephen, and was bishop of St. Asaph in 1152. In his British History he affirms, that Brutus, the great-grandson of Æneas, and after him above seventy glorious monarchs, reigned in this island, during a period of 1053 years, before the invasion of Julius Cæsar. He continues his narrative to the death of Cadwallader, in the year 689.

This history contains the story of king Lear and his daughters; an account of the wonderful exploits of Uther Pendragon, and king Arthur; the prophesies of Merlin, and many similar curiosities. See above, chap. iii.

‡ Prid. Connect. vol. ii. p. 804.

as that of Jewish and ecclesiastical antiquity*. Here we read of the BOOKS of Abel, Seth, Enoch, Shem, Abraham, and Og the giant; the TESTAMENTS of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Job, Moses, Solomon, and the twelve patriarchs; the LITURGIES of Matthew, Mark, John, James, Peter, the Virgin Mary, and Jesus Christ; the ACTS of Andrew, John, Mark, Matthias, Paul, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Pilate, Caiaphas, and Thecla; the EPISTLES of Luke to Galen, Peter to James, John to a man who had the dropsy, Paul to the Laodiceans, and the Virgin Mary to Ignatius; the GOSPELS of James, Andrew, Thomas, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthias, Barnabas, Thaddæus, Peter, Paul, Nicodemus, Judas Iscariot, and Eve; the REVELATIONS of Peter, Stephen, Paul, Thomas, Solomon, Moses, Job, Elias, Abraham, Noah, Adam; the MAGICAL WRITINGS of Solomon, Joseph, Abraham, Ham, and Noah †.

To this list we may add the following extract from a decree of pope Gelasius I. made in the year 494, De Libris apocryphis, &c.

Itinerarium nomine Petri apostoli, quod appellatur S. Clementis, libri viii. apocryphum.
Actus nomine Andreæ apostoli, apoc.
Actus nomine Philippi apostoli, apoc.
Actus nomine Petri apostoli, apoc.

* Illud me vehementer movet, quòd videam primis ecclesiæ temporibus quamplurimos extitisse, qui facinus palmarium judicabant, cœlestem veritatem figmentis suis ire adjutum; quo faciliùs videlicet nova doctrina à gentium sapientibus admitteretur. Officiosa hæc mendacia vocabant, bono fine excogitata. Quo ex forte dubio procul sunt orti LIBRI SEXCENTI, quos illa ætas & proxima viderunt. Casaub. in Baron. Annales Exercit. I. num. 18. p. 54.

† Fabric. Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. Cod. Apoc. Nov. Test. passim.

Actus nomine Thomæ apoſtoli, apoc.
Evangelium nomine Thaddæi, apoc.
Evangelium nomine Thomæ apoſtoli, quo utuntur Manichæi, apoc.
Evangelium nomine Barnabæ, apoc.
Evangelium nomine Bartholomæi apoſtoli, apoc.
Evangelium nomine Andreæ apoſtoli, apoc.
Evangelia, quæ falſavit Lucianus, apoc.
Evangelia, quæ falſavit Heſychius, apoc.
Liber de Infantiâ Salvatoris, apoc.
Liber de Nativitate Salvatoris, et de S. Mariâ, et de obſtetrice Salvatoris, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Paſtoris, apoc.
Libri omnes, quos fecit Lenticius, diſcipulus diaboli, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur de filiabus Adæ, vel Geneſis, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Actus Theclæ & Pauli apoſtoli, apoc.
Revelatio, quæ appellatur Thomæ apoſtoli, apoc.
Revelatio, quæ appellatur Pauli apoſtoli, apoc.
Revelatio, quæ appellatur Stephani, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Tranſitus S. Mariæ, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Pœnitentia Adæ, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Diogenes, nomine gigantis, qui poſt diluvium cum dracone pugnaſſe perhibetur, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Teſtamentum Job, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Sortes apoſtolorum, apoc.
Liber, qui appellatur Laus apoſtolorum, apoc.
Liber Canonum apoſtolorum, apoc.
Epiſtola Jeſu ad Abgarum regem, apocrypha, &c. *

* Fabric. Cod. Apoc. p. 65. 135. Varrerii Cenſura, p. 14. &c.

The

The decree, from which this catalogue is taken, is ſuppoſed by Dr. Cave *, and ſome other eccleſiaſtical writers, to be ſuppoſititious. But the learned Caſaubon ſpeaks of it in much more favourable terms. For having mentioned the goſpel according to the Egyptians, the prophecy of Ham, the apocalypſe of Moſes, and other notorious forgeries, he calls it, "inſigniter ſalutare decretum," a very ſalutary decree, in which, he ſays, many books of this deſpicable ſort are ſpecified and condemned †.

However, whether it is genuine or not, it will ſerve to ſhew us, what numbers of abſurd and ſcandalous publications were impoſed upon the world, in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, under the reſpectable names of apoſtles and evangeliſts. Hanc legem, ſays Varrerius on a quotation from the ſame decree, hic duximus ſubjiciendam, ut meliùs intelligatur, quantùm præpoſtera hominum ingenia fallacibus hujuſmodi et fucoſis artibus delectentur ‡."—Suppoſing the decree itſelf is a forgery, it is but an addition to the impoſitions already mentioned.

If we deſcend to the primitive fathers, we ſhall find a multitude of ſpurious productions under their names. Cave ‖ enumerates thirty pieces of that kind, which have been aſcribed to Cyprian; thirty, which have been attributed to Athanaſius; thirty, which have appeared under the name of Jerom; ſixty, which have been publiſhed as the works of Auſtin; ſeventy, which have been fathered on Chryſoſtom; and ſo on, in proportion to the reputation of each reſpective writer.

The number of forgeries, falſe records, and counter-

* Cave, Hiſt. Liter. ſub an. 492.

† Caſaub. in Baron. Annal. Exercit. i. p. 22. 54.

‡ De Beroſo Cenſura, p. 14.

‖ Cave, Hiſt. Liter.

feit

feit antiquities, imposed upon the world by the advocates of the church of Rome *, in support of their religion, or, more properly speaking, their SYSTEM of SUPERSTITION, exceeds almost all imagination, and affords a deplorable instance of the depravity of mankind, and the facility, with which knaves and bigots have suppressed every suggestion of conscience, reason, and religion, while they were engaged in the pursuit of what is absurdly, if not ironically, called a PIOUS FRAUD!

If we confine our observations to the present century, and to our own country in particular, we shall meet with several notorious instances of literary craft and imposition.

The late Psalmanazar wrote a fictitious history of Formosa †, and invented a new language, which, he pretended, was the language of that island. The imposition was supported for some time; and the author was caressed as a prodigy of abstinence, piety, and learning. But in the latter part of his life, his conscience began to upbraid him; and, in a posthumous publication, he acknowledged, that the account, which he had given of Formosa, and of his travels and conversion from paganism to Christianity, was an infamous fiction ‡.

In

* See a book, entitled, Roman Forgeries, published in 1673.

† An historical and geographical Description of Formosa, 8vo. 1704.—A second edition of this work was published in 1705, with a preface, containing, "an answer to every thing, that had been objected against the author and his book."

Psalmanazar died in 1763, about the eighty-sixth year of his age.

‡ Memoirs of ****, commonly known by the name of George Psalmanazar, a reputed native of Formosa, written by himself, in order to be published after his death, &c. 8vo. 1764.

In his will he says: "The principal manuscript I thought myself in duty bound to leave behind, is a faithful narrative of my education,

In the year 1747, the literati were surprised at the appearance of an Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns, in his Paradise Lost, by William Lauder *; the tendency of which was to shew, that Milton was a plagiary. In pursuance of this design, he charged Milton with having borrowed many parts of his plan, many passages, sentiments, and images, from the Sarcotis of Masenius, the Adamus Exul of Grotius, the Triumphus Pacis of Staphorstius, the Comœdia Apocalyptica of John Fox, the Locustæ of Phineas Fletcher, the Bellum Angelicum of Taubman †, and other similar productions.

Some

education, and the sallies of my wretched youthful years, and the various ways, by which I was, in some measure, unavoidably led into the base and shameful imposture, of passing upon the world for a native of Formosa, and a convert to Christianity, and backing it with a fictitious account of that island, and of my own travels, conversion, &c. all or most of it hatched in my own brain, without regard to truth and honesty," p. 5, 6.

* Lauder commenced his attack upon Milton in the Gentleman's Magazine for January 1747; and continued his animadversions, at different times, in that publication. An imaginary success prompted him to reprint his extracts and observations, with considerable additions, in a separate volume, 8vo. which appeared in December 1749.

† Jacobus Masenius was professor of rhetoric and poetry, in the Jesuits college at Cologn. His Sarcotis consists of five books, and was printed about the year 1654. An elegant edition of this poem; and of some other pieces, by Masenius and Grenan, was published at Paris in 1771, with some observations on Lauder's controversy.

Grotius is said to have written his tragedy, entitled, Adamus Exul, when he was only eighteen years of age. It was printed at Leyden in 1601; but was not inserted in the collection of his poems.

Caspar Staphorstius was a Dutch poet and divine. His Triumphus Pacis was a congratulatory poem, on the conclusion of the peace

Some of the examples, which he produced, in support of this accusation, bore such a striking resemblance to passages in the Paradise Lost, that many of his readers were inclined to applaud his sagacity, and the propriety of his remarks.

But while the enemies of Milton were shouting, *Iō triumphe!* and insulting the memory of the injured poet, an acute and learned writer rose up in his defence, and effectually exposed this master-piece of fraud and imposition, by demonstrating, that Lauder had inserted several passages of Hog's translation * of Paradise Lost, and other lines of his own composition, into the extracts, which he had produced from Masenius, Staphorstius, and others; and then urged those very lines as a proof, that Milton had copied them †.

As this charge was unanswerable, Lauder thought proper to throw himself on the candor of the public,

peace between the states of Holland, and the commonwealth of England, in 1655.

John Fox, the martyrologist, published his Comœdia Apocalyptica, or Christus Triumphans, in 1551.

Phineas Fletcher was Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. His poem against the Jesuits, entitled, Locustæ, vel Pietas Jesuitica, was printed in 1627.

Taubman, the author of Bellum Angelicum, printed about the year 1604, was the celebrated commentator on Plautus and Virgil.

* Paraphrasis poetica in tria Johannis Miltoni, V. C. poemata, viz. Paradisum Amissum, Paradisum Recuperatum, et Samsonem Agonisten. Autore Gulielmo Hogæo. Londini, 1690.

† Milton vindicated from the charge of plagiarism, brought against him by Mr. Lauder; and Lauder himself convicted of several FORGERIES and gross IMPOSITIONS on the public. By John Douglas, M. A. [now bishop of Carlisle.] 8vo. 1751.

A second edition of this pamphlet was published in 1756.

by ſubſcribing a penitential acknowledgment, dictated by a learned friend, of all his interpolations in the writers he had quoted *.

In the year 1762, an enterprizing writer publiſhed an epic poem in ſix books, entitled Fingal, and other pieces, of a ſingular character, under the name of Oſſian, which were ſaid to have been tranſlated from the Galic or Erſe. The truth of this aſſertion has been frequently controverted. It is however ſtrenuouſly maintained by thoſe, who are advocates for the literary glory of Caledonia. But the very exiſtence of Oſſian, if ever there was ſuch a poet, is, like the hiſtory of Orpheus, enveloped in fable and romance; and though we may allow the pretended tranſlator to have collected ſome traditionary ſtories, ſome ancient fragments, and ſome ſtrolling ballads, we may reaſonably ſuſpect, that the greateſt part of theſe poems have been compoſed by the editor, as he has never condeſcended to favour the world with the works of Oſſian in their original language, though ſuch a publication has been frequently requeſted †; and would have not only ſilenced all ob-

* This confeſſion was entitled, A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Douglas, occaſioned by his vindication of Milton, &c. By Wm. Lauder, A. M. 4to. 1751. It was dictated by the late Dr. Johnſon, who, at firſt, had conceived a favourable opinion of Lauder's abilities and integrity. Lauder however in the year 1754, retracted his confeſſion, defended his eſſay, and made a new attack upon Milton, in a pamphlet, entitled, "King Charles I. vindicated from the charge of plagiariſm, brought againſt him by Milton; and Milton himſelf convicted of forgery, and a groſs impoſition on the public. —Lauder died in Barbadoes, about the year 1771.

† Dr. Johnſon required, that the original ſhould be depoſited in either the king's or the mariſchal college at Aberdeen, and ſubmitted to public inſpection; but this was never done. Hawkins's Life of Johnſon, p. 488.

jections, but have been esteemed a valuable curiosity in the republic of letters *.

About the beginning of the year 1777, the attention of the public was excited by a volume of Poems, which were said to have been written at Bristol by Thomas Rowley, a secular priest of that city, and others, in the fifteenth century †. These pieces were read with surprise and admiration, and occasioned a variety of conjectures, relative to their authenticity. It was asserted, that the original manuscripts had been found in an old chest in Redcliff church, at Bristol, by one Chatterton the sexton; that Chatterton gave them to his nephew, the master of a writing-school in Pile-street ‡; and that, after the death of the latter, they fell into the hands of his son, Thomas Chatterton, who sent some of them to the editors of the magazines, and disposed of others.

Some learned writers have maintained, that they are the genuine productions of Rowley ‖; others have supposed, that they were not written by Rowley, but forged by Chatterton §, who probably derived the first idea of such

* It is said, that Ossian was the son of Fingal, a king of Scotland, celebrated for his prowess; that he lived in the beginning of the fourth century; and that these poems are superior to those of all other Caledonian bards, both in genius and antiquity.

† In the reigns of Henry VI. and Edward IV.

‡ Account of Chatterton by Dean Milles.

‖ Their authenticity is asserted in several publications, particularly the following:—" Poems, supposed to have been written at Bristol, by Thomas Rowley, &c. with a Commentary. By Jeremiah Milles, Dean of Exeter, 4to. 1782."

" Observations upon the Poems of Thomas Rowley, in which the authenticity of those poems is ascertained. By Jacob Bryant, Esq. 8vo. 1782."

§ Thomas Chatterton, the hero of this controversy, was born Nov. 20, 1752, and educated at a charity-school in Bristol. At the age of fourteen, he was articled clerk to an attorney in that city.

ſuch a project from ſome old parchments, which might have been found, as he aſſerted, in a cheſt in Redcliff church.

This opinion ſeems to be much more probable than the other, for the following reaſons.

1. It is hardly to be imagined, that all the poems, aſcribed to Rowley, could have lain in a cheſt, unobſerved and unexamined, for the ſpace of 300 years; and that there ſhould not, during this long interval, have been one, among all the learned vicars of Redcliff church, who had the curioſity to examine, and the ſagacity to diſcover, the contents of this wonderful repoſitory.

2. The phraſeology, the ſplendid deſcriptions, the poetical images, the harmony of the verſification, very unuſual with writers of the fifteenth century, the manifeſt imitation of later poets, ſome apparent anachroniſms, and OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES, are ſtrong preſumptive evidences, that they are not the compoſitions of Rowley.

Chatterton's abilities for a work of this nature can hardly be doubted, if we attend either to his comments on the poems attributed to Rowley, or to many ſimilar pieces, which, we are aſſured, are his genuine and acknowledged productions *.

But,

city. In April 1770, he came to London, in hopes of advancing his fortune by his pen; but he was ſo miſerably diſappointed, that about four months afterwards, in a fit of deſpair, he put an end to his life, at the age of ſeventeen years and nine months.

* See Remarks on Chatterton's Miſcellanies by the Author of this Diſſertation, in the Critical Review for Auguſt 1778, where it is ſhewn, that there have been many EARLY GENIUSES, equal or ſuperior to Chatterton, in the republic of letters.

On this occaſion, the preſent Diſſertator, though he owns thoſe inſignificant remarks, would wiſh to intimate, that his concern in the

But, not to dwell any longer on ſuppoſititious BOOKS, let us proceed to fictitious INSCRIPTIONS.

the ſame Review extended only from Auguſt 1764 to September 1785 incluſive; and that he is not, at preſent, accountable for any criticiſms, which appear in that publication.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

ABOUT the year 1435, Cyriacus Anconitanus, surnamed the Antiquary, collected inscriptions, and other remains of antiquity, in different parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa *. He pretended to have found a multitude of inscriptions in Spain, as well as in other countries, which Ambrosius Morales, and other Spanish historians, quoted upon his authority. But the learned and judicious Antonius Augustinus, archbishop of Tarragon, assures us, that many of these inscriptions were fictitious; and that, in his time, none of them were to be seen in Spain †.

In

* Cyriacus's inscriptions, in three volumes, folio, entitled, Antiquarum Rerum Commentaria, were never entirely published. Some of them only were communicated by himself to his friends; about 200 were printed by C. Moronus in 1660, and others have appeared in different collections.

A small volume in 12mo. entitled, Kyriaci Anconitani Itinerarium, was published by Laurentius Mehus, at Florence, in 1742, containing eight Letters by Kyriacus, and a preface by the editor, in vindication of the author's literary character. But this publication contains no inscriptions, nor any very important information.

† Cyriaci Anconitani inscriptiones plurimas in Annalibus Hispaniæ Ambrosius Morales temerè descripsit. B. Mirari equidem soleo in tot tantísque antiquis inscriptionibus, quas ille attulit, nullas hodiè in Hispaniâ legi. A. Illud incommodi est, videri Joannem Annium & Cyriacum, similísque farinæ homines, Hispanos irridere voluisse, confictis Hispanorum rebus gestis sub Noâ, Tubale; serie item contextâ regum falsorum, quasi nostris regnassent temporibus; fictis adhæc lapidibus, de bello cum Viriatho, & Sertorio; civili quoque Cæsaris ac Pompeii, &c. Augustini Antiquitatum Dialogi. xi. p. 161.

Augustinus's

In 1534, Petrus Apianus and Bartholomæus Amantius published a large collection of antiquities at Ingolstadt, in which they inserted a considerable number of those, which had been either collected or invented by Kyriacus *. The learned writer I have just now cited affirms, that many of these inscriptions are forged by different authors †.

About the year 1520, Alexander Geraldinus pretended to have found in various parts of Ethiopia, on both sides of the equinoxial line, many Roman inscriptions and antiquities ‡, more valuable (if genuine)

Augustinus's Dialogues were published in the Spanish language in 1587, and translated into Latin by And. Schottus, 1617. The author died in 1588, aged 71 years. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 10. p. 809.

Reinesius speaks favourably of Cyriacus. Inscript. Antiq. præf. p. ii.

* This collection bears the following title: Inscriptiones sacrosanctæ vetustatis, non illæ quidem Romanæ, sed totius ferè orbis, summo studio ac maximis impensis terrâ marique conquisitæ, feliciter incipiunt. Magnifico viro, domino Raymundo Fuggero, &c. Petrus Apianus Mathematicus, & Bartholomæus Amantius Poeta. D. E. D. Ingolstadii, anno MDXXXIV.

Primi, qui excerpta ex Kyriaci schedis typis excuderunt, fuere Petrus Apianus & Bartholomæus Amantius. Kyriaci Itin. præf. p. 59.

† In antiquitatibus orbis totius, à Petro Apiano & Bartholomæo Amantio foràs datis, fictæ multæ sunt à diversis auctoribus inscriptiones. Aug. Dial. xi. p. 162. Menagiana, tom. iv. p. 263.—One of the first in this collection is the foolish prophecy of H. Cajadus, which will be mentioned hereafter.

‡ Alexandri Geraldini Itinerarium ad regiones sub æquinoxiali plagâ constitutas. [anno 1520; complectens antiquitates & ritus populorum Æthiopiæ, Africæ, Atlantici oceani, & Indicarum regionum. Accesserunt auctoris opuscula alia, edente Onuphrio Geraldino, ejus abnepote.] 8vo. Romæ, 1631.—Geraldinus was made bishop of St. Domingo, the capital of Hispaniola, in 1516, and died in 1525.

than

than all the inſcriptions and antiquities, which the reſt of the world could produce. But it is obſervable, that no traveller, beſides himſelf, ever ſaw theſe curioſities; and, as M. de la Mothe le Vayer remarks, "it is the greateſt impertinence to raiſe imaginary pillars, and bear teſtimony to the conqueſts and dominion of the Romans, in places, where apparently no Roman ever ſet his foot, and in direct oppoſition to their own hiſtorians *." Geraldinus appears to have been as great a traveller, and—as great a romancer, as Leo Africanus: par nobile fratrum!

In 1636, Curtius Inghiramius publiſhed a volume of Tuſcan Antiquities †, containing a multitude of Latin inſcriptions, relative to the origin of Volaterra, Sena, Rome, &c. which, he ſays, he found under-ground at Scornellum, near Volaterra. The inſcriptions, he tells us, were written by one Proſperus Feſulanus, who lived in the time of Cicero ‡, and depoſited by him in that place, with an epiſtle to the finder, in which he prophetically deſcribes the ſaid Inghiramius; lays many ſtrict injunctions on him not to communicate the originals to any one; and denounces the moſt horrible calamities on ſuch as ſhould preſume to ſteal, to touch them, to depreciate the credit of the finder, or rob him of the glory, to which he was entitled for the diſcovery of theſe ineſtimable treaſures ‖.

It

* De la Mothe le Vayer, des anciens Hiſtoriens Grecs & Latins.

† This work is entitled, Ethruſcarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta, quibus urbis Romæ, aliarumque gentium primordia, mores, & res geſtæ indicantur, à Curtio Inghiramio reperta Scornelli prope Vulterram. Francofurti, anno ſalutis MDCXXXVII. Ethruſco verò cIↃ cIↃ cIↃ cIↃ CCCCXCV. Folio. A former edition was printed at Florence in 1636.

‡ Bef. Chr. 60.

‖ Alius, ſi fortè invenerit, eas ſcripturas tangere non audeat; alioquin

• It is easy to see the author's views in throwing out these denunciations. Though they were perfectly absurd and ridiculous, they were plainly intended to check the impertinent curiosity, the animadversions, and the ridicule of his opposers.

The whole performance however bears the most obvious marks of fraud and imposition *. The characters do not in the least correspond with the mode of writing in the time of Cicero; the Latinity is mean and barbarous; the customs, which are occasionally mentioned, were unknown in ancient Rome; and the stories, which are told of the patriarch Noah, are alone sufficient to expose the grossness of the cheat.

To these remarks we may add, that the artist very simply and inadvertently wrote his inscriptions on paper, which was known to have been made about the time of the pretended discovery †.

Some have ascribed this performance to Postellus ‡; some, to Paganinus Gaudentius; others affirm, that the author was Thomas Phaedrus or Foedrus, who was keeper of the Vatican library, about the year 1490. It is most probable, that Inghiramius himself was the real fabricator of all these ridiculous inscriptions ||.

alioquin superûm infernorumque deorum iram expertus peribit infelix . . . Si quis has scripturas quovis modo sibi arripuerit, famae et corporis jacturam faciet . . . Si quis nomen suum augere his scripturis, vel tuum deprimere fuerit ausus, rerum suarum, vitae, & honoris, maximum damnum passus omnibus ludibrio erit. Verùm nec haeredes tui nec tu, inventas scripturas aliis dare audeatis, nam malum instat, sed transcriptas poteris dare cui volueris, &c. p. 3, 4.

* Vid. Leon. Allatii Animadversiones in Antiquitatum Etruscarum Fragmenta, ab Inghiramio edita, 4to. Paris, 1640.

† Ibid. p. 91.

‡ Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. i. c. 9. p. 41.

|| Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. § 3. p. 601. Vid. Saxii Onomast. vol. iv. p. 422. Placcii Theat. Pseudon. p. 523.

But the moſt enterprizing and eminent practitioner in the art of making fictitious inſcriptions, was Annius of Viterbo, whom I have already mentioned. Antonius Auguſtinus gives us the following account of the proceſs, which Annius obſerved in his forgeries.

"Mihi Latinus Latinius * Viterbienſis, vir doctus, bonæque fidei, de Joanne Annio, Viterbienſi monacho, narrare jucundè ſolebat. Lapidi inſculpendas curâſſe literas, quem vineæ infodi juſſerat, non procul à Viterbio. Cúmque fodienda eſſet vinea, ad lapidem uſque ut fodiendo pervenirent juſſit; narrans in libris ſe reperiſſe, templum ibi orbis terrarum antiquiſſimum latere. Terrâ jam effoſſâ, primus, qui lapidem invenit, vinitor accurrit; paulatim detegi ſarcophagum imperat. Hic ſtupens, lapidis antiquitatem, & literas à ſe confictas, admiratur; ac deſcribens, ad urbis ſenatores lætus confugit, & civitatis honori fore perſuadet, in ampliſſimo publicè ſpectari loco. Viterbii enim urbis originem contineri, quæ bis mille annis Romanâ eſſet urbe à Romulo conditâ longè antiquior, utpote ab Iſide & Oſiride conditæ. Fabulas hic ſuas, quibus abundabat, venditavit, factúmque ut ille juſſerat. Fertur manuſcripta inſcriptio ficta, typis etiam evulgata, hoc initio, EGO SUM ISIS †."

"Latinus Latinius, a native of Viterbo, a man of learning and veracity, uſed to relate, with ſome humour, the following anecdote of John Annius, a dominican friar of that city.

"Annius got an inſcription engraved on a ſtone, which he buried in a vineyard near Viterbo. When the

* Latinus Latinius was born at Viterbo about the year 1513. He publiſhed notes on Tertullian, and a work, entitled, Bibliotheca ſacra et profana, ſive obſervationes, correctiones, conjecturæ, & variæ lectiones.

† Auguſt. Dial. xi. p. 160.

the labourers were employed in digging the ground, he directed them to proceed, till they came to the ſpot, where the ſtone was depoſited; telling them he had found in his books, that the ruins of the moſt ancient temple in the world lay under-ground in that place. After the earth was removed, the ſtone actually appeared; upon which the vine-dreſſer, who firſt diſcovered this wonderful curioſity, ran to Annius, and acquainted him with what he had found. The ſarcophagus was ordered to be removed with all poſſible care. Annius, in the mean time, ſeemed to be aſtoniſhed at the antiquity of the ſtone, and extremely delighted with the inſcription. In the height of his pretended exultation, he flew to the magiſtrates of Viterbo, expatiated on the nature and importance of the diſcovery, and perſuaded them, that this venerable monument of antiquity would be an everlaſting honour to the city, if they would remove it to a conſpicuous place, where it might be publicly exhibited. He obſerved, that it related to the origin of Viterbo; and that Rome, founded 2000 years ſince by Romulus, was far inferior in point of antiquity to Viterbo, which was built by Iſis and Oſiris. With theſe romantic ſtories, which he readily invented, he amuſed the public; and his orders were inſtantly obeyed. An inſcription was circulated in manuſcript, and afterwards printed, beginning with theſe words, EGO SUM ISIS, I am Iſis."

A project of the ſame kind was managed, with ſome ſucceſs, by one Hermicus Cajadus, or Hermio Gajado, a Portugueſe poet, about the year 1505 *. When his countrymen had made a conqueſt of ſeveral places in Africa, and the Eaſt Indies, he compoſed ſome Latin verſes, in the ſtyle of a Sibylline prophecy, foretelling theſe conqueſts; and having engraved them on three marble columns, he MUTILATED THE STONES, and

* Cajadus died of intoxication in 1508. Ladvocat.

DEFACED some of the inscriptions, in order to give them an appearance of antiquity. He then buried them in the ground; and, at a proper opportunity, contrived a scheme for the discovery, which was artfully managed, and attended with great exultation. The inscription, which was undefaced, was read, admired, touched and kissed, with the profoundest veneration; and afterwards published as a divine prophecy *.

The Duilian inscription has been reckoned a most

* Is Latinis carminibus commentus fuerat Sibyllinam vaticinationem, in columnis marmoreis incisam, quæ per ambages significabat, Indos sub imperium & ditionem Lusitanorum esse venturos, eosque lapides datâ operâ DETRUNCATOS, ut aliqua inessent ANTIQUITATIS vestigia, obrui præcepit . . . . Ubi verò defossa marmora aliquod vitium fecisse, ex humore terreno, judicavit, ad certam diem, simulatâ delectationis causâ, invitat amicos in villam suam, quæ proxima erat loco, ubi obrutum latebat vaticinium. Cum igitur accubuissent omnes, ecce villicus nunciat Hermico, mercenarias ejus operas, dum in fundo fossionibus incumberent, incidisse in lapides, in quibus inscriptæ essent literæ, indices magni cujusdam thesauri, eodem loco defossi; sic enim rustici opinabantur. Nec morâ, omnes simul, alacritate ingenti, relictis epulis, accurrunt, defossas intuentur columnas, confestimque extrahi jubent; in quibus incisa hujusmodi erant carmina Sibyllina:

Sibyllæ vaticinium, occidiis decretum,
Volventur saxa literis, & ordine rectis,
Cum videas occidens orientis opes.
Ganges Indus Tagus erit, mirabile visu,
Merces commutabit suas uterque sibi.
Soli æterno, ac lunæ decretum.

Tum vero omnes, pro se quisque legere, admirari, versus illos fatidicos venerari, manu tangere, exosculari . . . . Ita Sibyllina fabula vires acquirit eundo, ac tandem per totum terrarum orbem divulgata, fides ei ubique et auctoritas adjungitur, hodiéque typis excusa circumfertur in fronte codicis, cui titulus est, "Inscriptiones antiquæ." Varrerii Censura in quendam Auctorem, qui sub falsâ Inscriptione Berosi Chaldæi circumfertur, p. 15. edit. 1598. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. vol. ii. p. 607.

curious

curious and valuable relic of antiquity *, yet Selden ſeems to queſtion its authenticity; for having occaſion to mention its age, in ſpeaking of the Parian Chronicle, he intimates his ſuſpicions in theſe words, SI NIMIRÙM GENUINA EST †.

Reineſius aſſerts, that Fulvius Urſinus has publiſhed many fictitious inſcriptions ‡.

Fleetwood, in his Inſcriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge, informs his readers, that though he was, as much as poſſible, on his guard againſt falſe and fictititious inſcriptions, he often found, that he had inadvertently inſerted, "plurimas apertè ſpurias," many that are evi-

* C. Duilius commanded the Roman fleet in the firſt Carthaginian war, and gained a complete victory. To perpetuate the memory of this triumph, a pillar of white marble was erected to his honour at Rome. This pillar is called Columna roſtrata, from the roſtra, or beaks of ſhips, with which it was adorned. On the baſis of the column was an inſcription, recording the exploits of Duilius, and the value of the booty, which was taken in the Carthaginian ſhips. The remains of this pillar were accidentally dug up, in the year 1560, in the place, which was formerly the Forum Romanum; and, by the order of Cardinal Alexander Farneſe, was removed to the capitol.

The inſcription, which is in old Latin, is ſuppoſed to have been written 260 years before the Chriſtian æra, and is reckoned the moſt ancient Latin monument now remaining.

Juſtus Lipſius endeavoured to ſupply the deficiencies in the inſcription. Pet. Ciacconius did the ſame, and explained the ſenſe in a learned commentary, entitled, Pet. Ciacconii in Columnæ Roſtratæ C. Duilii inſcriptionem, à ſe conjecturâ ſuppletam, Commentarius. Lug. Bat. 1597. Græv. Theſaur. tom. iv. p. 1807. Univ. Hiſt. vol. xvii. p. 224. 506. xii. p. 171. edit. 1740.

† Seld. Marm. Arund. in edit. Anſâ, p. 3.

‡ De Urſino dixeram, cautè me arripere ſolere, quas ab ipſo profectas ſcirem, inſcriptiones; & paratus ſum, ſi quis poſtulet, FICTITIAS eum PLURIMAS extruſiſſe probare. Reineſii ad Rupertum Epiſt. 50. p. 456. Epiſt. 43. p. 418. Epiſt. 51. p. 487. 490. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 5.

dently

dently ſpurious *. And Stillingfleet affirms, that there are many counterfeits in Gruter's collection †.

As a farther confirmation of what I have here obſerved, I ſhall ſubjoin the remarks of a learned writer, who in this inſtance, has advanced none of his uſual paradoxes.

" Falſarum inſcriptionum architectos proximum noſtro ſæculum INNUMEROS tulit; egregios artifices, qui, quas ipſi magnâ, ut ſibi quidem videbantur, arte concinnaſſent, has aut in marmoribus, aut in tabulis æneis, plumbeíſve, aut lateritiis fiſtulis, aut in antiquis denique numiſmatis, lectas à ſe fuiſſe mentirentur. Sed et aliquot ante ætatibus fraus eadem in uſu fuit. Plena ſunt pergamena manu exarata fictis in otio inſcriptionibus, epitaphiis, elogiis; quæ cum inde eruuntur à viris etiam alioqui magnis ac probis, ſed minus juſto ſuſpicioſis, ab eorumdem ſuffragio pondus illa accipiunt; ac deinde mirificè inquinant perturbantque prophanam hiſtoriam, utinam verò non etiam eccleſiaſticam.

" Superiore porrò ſæculo, inſigniores harum inſcriptionum fabricatores fuere Jovianus Pontanus, Pomponius Lætus, Joannes Camers, Cyriacus Aconitanus, aliique ‡. Hos enim in primis nominatim deſignat Antonius Auguſtinus, Dialogo xi. p. 161. E Cyriaci verò officinâ plurimas in Annales Hiſpaniæ transfudit Ambroſius Morales ‖, et exinde Gruterus in Theſaurum ſuum; è tot autem inſcriptionibus nullum hodie in

* Epiſt. dedic. p. 10.

† " Not only authors, but other monuments of antiquity, were then counterfeited, as appears by many in Gruter's Collection of Inſcriptions." Stillingf. Orig. Brit. pref. p. l.

‡ Jovianus Pontanus fl. circa 1460. Saxii Onomaſt. Pomponius Lætus, circa 1484. Ibid. Joannes Camers, circa 1510. Ibid.

‖ Ambroſius Moralis, ſive de Morales, circa 1574.

Hiſpaniâ legi, teſtis eſt idem Antonius Auguſtinus, vir ſummæ eruditionis, limatique judicii, qui de Joanne Annio, Italiſque aliis præterea conqueritur, quòd ſuæ, nempe Hiſpaniæ, genti epigrammata et marmora obtruſerint, nec viſa illis, nec ab Hiſpanis reperta; atque ea demum ille cum Amadiſii Gallici et Orlandi Furioſi nugis commentiſque confert. Inſcriptionum hujuſmodi immenſam ſupellectilem, quadraginta amplius digeſtam voluminibus, olim collegit Pyrrhus Ligorius; quæ Romæ extare dicitur in bibliothecâ Barberinnâ et Farneſianâ. Quâ in vaſtâ mole atque congerie, Spanhemius, vir eruditus, confitetur, p. 141. "plura eſſe aut dubiæ fidei, aut confeſſæ novitatis." Nec tantam ille creviſſe ſegetem putat, niſi ex plurimorum fraude, qui Ligorio viro bono fucum fecerint. Farraginem eam eſſe ſubdit, quæ poſſit incautis imponere, avidis ad quamcumque ciborum novitatem, viris etiam alioquin eruditis, ſed, ut dixi, minime ſuſpicioſis. Neque enim HEBETES ac STULTI ſunt, qui dant operam, ut hâc arte fallant. Sic Muretus olim Scaligero ipſi impoſuit, quem induxit ut crederet, Attii et Trabeæ *, veterum, ut aiunt, poetarum carmina quædam eſſe; quæ idem Muretus, à ſe conficta, ſub eorum nominibus Scaligero ſubmiſerat. E veteribus etiam ſchedis Joſephi Scaligeri deſcribitur à Grutero poſita, ut quidem ait, Nicomediæ inſcriptio: quis hanc, amabo, ad Scaligerum Nicomediâ attulit?

"Atqui non Gruterum modò, ſed et eos, qui volumini ejus amplificando ſuam veluti ſymbolam contulerunt, fefellerunt ii, qui vel ex marmoribus ea ſe deſcripſiſſe elogia teſtati ſunt; vel eruta ex membranis fallacibus inſculpere lapidibus, ſuperiore præſertim ſæculo, ad aliquam patriæ ſuæ laudem, incautè ſategerunt; vel QUI

* See an account of this impoſition in Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 1. p. 198. edit. 1728.

DENIQUE

DENIQUE INSIGNI FRAUDE INSCULPSERE IPSI, AC TELLURI SUFFODERUNT, QUÆ DEINDE VEL IPSIMET, VEL POSTERI, EFFOSSA INGENTI AURO VENDERENT. Vix enim repertum erutúmve talem fuisse lapidem reperias, ante annum MDX. Post hunc annum innumera sunt, eo quem diximus astu, reperta. Itaque in illo Thesauro Gruteriano INFINITI CARBONES LATENT. Neque ex sexaginta ferè inscriptionibus, quæ Constantiniani hujus sæculi esse æstimantur, vel una quidem sincera est, si inscriptionem Arcûs Constantiniani exceperis *."

Similar observations occur in almost every author, who has written upon the subject.

* Harduini Opera Selecta, p. 501.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

THE examples, which I have produced in the foregoing chapter, will, I think, be ſufficient to ſhew, what frauds have been committed, in the fabrication of inſcriptions; and with what CAUTION we ſhould credit ſuch memorials.

In a queſtion of importance, like the preſent, a writer, who is in purſuit of truth, will examine every circumſtance with impartiality and freedom; and if he ſees ſo many difficulties on every ſide, that he can form no SATISFACTORY concluſion, he will ſuſpend his opinion, and be content to remain in the number of thoſe, "who neither believe nor diſbelieve every thing:" Ουτε πασι πιϛευοντες, ουτε πασιν απιϛουντες *.

This precaution is the more neceſſary, in the preſent inſtance, as ſuppoſititious books and inſcriptions have been ſo numerous, and are, in reality, a diſgrace to the republic of letters. Without any breach of charity we may aſſert, that he, who obtrudes any thing upon the world, under the name of antiquity, which has no title to that venerable character, deſerves to be branded, as the worſt of impoſtors; or, to uſe the language of Plautus, ſent to live,

> Apud fuſtitudinas, ferricrepinas inſulas,
> Ubi vivos homines mortui incurſant boves †.

Whoever

* Ariſt. Rhet. l. ii. c. 14.

† Plaut. Aſin. act. i. ſc. 1. 20.—Fuſtitudinas and ferricrepinas are words coined by Plautus. Mortui boves is a humorous phraſe

Whoever was the author of the Parian Chronicle, he stands in a higher class, than many of the modern forgers I have mentioned. His performance is written in a clear and classical style. It bears the marks of real learning, and a competent knowledge of Grecian history; so that in whatever light it is viewed, it is no contemptible production.

It is however worthy of observation, that the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton paid NO REGARD to its authority, in his Chronology of ancient Kingdoms.

The sixteenth century, and the former part of the seventeenth, prior to the discovery of the marbles, produced a multitude of grammarians, critics, commentators, and writers of every denomination, deeply versed in Grecian literature, and amply qualified for the compilation of such a short system of chronology, as that of the Arundelian marbles.

Above all, the science of chronology was particularly studied and investigated about that time. "Nunc fervet chronologia," says Scaliger in the year 1605; "omnes hoc ferrum excalfaciunt *." And Casaubon treats those persons with contempt, who were unacquainted with the improvements, which had been made in that department of learning, after the revival of letters. "Scientia temporum," says he, "quantopere fuerit post renatas literas exculta, quàm admirandâ acceperit incrementa, ASINUS est qui ignorat inter literatos; malignus, & beneficiorum DEI erga hoc seculum ingratus æstimator, qui dissimulat. Stupenda enim sunt,

phrase for strappadoes or whips, made of leather. A late translator renders these lines,

"In Club-island, and in that of Rattle-chain,
Where the dead oxen gore the living men."

* Scal. Epist. inter Opuscula, p. 521.

quæ

quæ viri ſummi in noſtrâ præſertim Galliâ & Germaniâ præſtiterunt *."

Innumerable ſyſtems of chronology had been publiſhed before the year 1625; from which it was eaſy to extract a ſeries of memorable events, and give the compilation a Grecian dreſs.

The avidity, with which all relics of antiquity were then collected, and the price, at which they were purchaſed, were ſufficient inducements to any one, whoſe avarice, or whoſe neceſſity, was ſtronger than his integrity, to engrave his lucubrations on marble, and tranſmit them to Smyrna, as a commodious emporium for ſuch rarities †.

Whether

* Caſaub. in Baron. Annal. exercit. 1. num. 99. p. 111.— Caſaubon's preliminary diſcourſe is dated 1614. He died July 1, 1614, aged 55.

† In thoſe days, there were numbers of learned Greeks, ready to engage in any fraudulent ſcheme, which was calculated to procure them any emolument. I ſhall take the liberty to mention one of this claſs.

Critopulus Metrophanes was ſent into England and Germany, by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Alexandria, to gain information concerning the ſtate and doctrine of the proteſtant churches in Europe.

Archbiſhop Abbot, in a letter to Sir Thomas Roe, then ambaſſador at Conſtantinople, recommends this gentleman in the following terms.

——" I recommend unto you this bearer Critophilus Metrophanes, a Greeke, borne in Byrræa, and ſent unto mee five or ſix yeeres ſince by Cyrill, then patriarke of Alexandria; and now of Conſtantinople. Hee hath remained all his time in Oxford, where I have taken care, that hee hath bene well and ſufficiently maintained, and thereby hath attained unto ſome reaſonable knowledge of the Engliſh tongue, not neglecting his ſtudies otherwiſe. Hee is a learned man, and hath lived in that univerſity with good report, whereof he is able to ſhew letters teſtimoniall to the good content-

Ff 2 ment,

Whether this was the case with the Parian Chronicle or not; whether it is an authentic monument of anti-
quity,

ment, as I hope, of that reverend man, from whom he was sent *.
. . . .

Lambeth, Nov. 20, 1622.

In a second letter to Sir Thomas, the archbishop gives a very different character of this learned Greek, as follows.

. . . . The Grecian Critopylus Metrophanes hath taken his journey very lately, into France or Holland, pretending from thence to go by land to Constantinople. I bred him full five yeeres in Oxford, with good allowance for diett, cloaths, bookes, chamber, and other necessaries; so that his expence, since his comeing into England, doth amount almost to three hundred pounds. Whiles hee was in that university, hee carried himselfe well; and at Michaelmas last I sent for him to Lambeth, taking care that in a very good shippe, hee might bee conveyed with accommodation of all things by the way. But by the ill counsell of some body, hee desired to go to the court at Newmarket, that hee might see the king before his departure. His majesty used him well; but there hee was putt into a conceite, that hee might gett some thinge to buy him bookes to cary home to the patriarke. The meanes that hee gaped after were such as you can hardly beleeve; at first, that hee should have a knight to bee made for his sake; and then, after that, a baronet, wherein a proiector should have shared with him: after that, the kinge was to be moved to give the advowson of a benefice, which a false simoniacal person did promise to buy of him. I caused my chaplaines to disswade him from these thinges, and interposed mine owne censure in it, as thinking these courses to bee vnwise, vnfitt, and vnworthy. But, to satisfy his desire, I bought him new out of the shoppe many of the best Greeke authors, and among them Chrysostome's eight tomes. I furnished him also with other bookes of worth, in Latin and in English, so that I may boldly say, it was a present fitt for mee to send to the patriarke of Constantinople. In the meane time, since Michaelmas last, I lodged him in my owne house, I sett him at my owne table, I cloathed him, and provided all conveniences for him; and would once againe

* Roe's Negot. let. 63. p. 102.

have

quity, or a modern compilation; whether its authority is indisputable, or, as I am inclined to think, APOCRY-PHAL,

have sent him away in a good shippe, that hee might safely have returned: but he fell into the company of certain Greeks, with whom wee have been much troubled for collections and otherwise; and although I knew them to bee counterfeits and vagabonds (as sundry times you have written unto me) yet I could not keepe my man within dores, but hee must bee abrode with them, to the expence of his time and mony. In breefe, writing a kind of epistle unto mee, that he would rather loose his bookes, suffer imprisonment, and loss of his life, then go home in any shippe; but that he would see the parts of christendome, and better his experience that way. I found that hee ment to turne roague and beggar, and more I cannot tell what; and therevpon I gave him ten pounds in his purse, and leaving him to Sir Paul Pindares care, at my remooving to Croydon, about a fortnights since, I dismist him. I had heard before of the basenes and slavishnes of that nation; but I could never haue beleeved, that any creature in humane shape, having learning, and such education as he hath had heere, could, after so many yeeres, have bene so farre from ingenuity, or any gratefull respect. But he must take his fortune, and I will learne by him to intreate so well no more of his fashion. Onley I have thus at large acquainted you with the vnworthy carriage of this fellow, which, though it bee indecent in him, yet for the patriarks sake I grudge it not vnto him, . . I remayne, &c. *

Croyden, Aug. 12, 1623.

Sir Thomas answers:

. . . . I have lett the good patriarch know the devious course taken by Metrophanes, of your bounty, and care for him, and all the circumstances of his departure. Att first hee seemed somwhat astonished; butt his affection towards him prevailed to make his excuse . . . . Hee hath given order to write into Holland, France, and diuers other parts, to recall this straye sheepe, to whom hee beares an entire loue; and if hee come hither, intends to make him a kind of coadiutor in judging of causes, and to conferr vpon him all the dignity hee can † . . . .

Constant. June 24, 1623.

* Roe's Negot. let. 3. p. 171. † Ibid. let. 142. p. 214.

In

PHAL, I shall now leave to the determination of the judicious and impartial reader.

Though

In a third letter, the archbishop says:

——I hold it fitt to give the patriarcke this account of Metrophanes; that in July last I gave him viaticum to carry him to Constantinople by land; and for a long time after, I heard of him, but saw him not; only in February or March last, hee came unto mee, and told mee, that hee was resolved then speedily to go home by sea, and would know what service I would command him. I told him, that for seven or eight moneths, hee had not knowne mee, and now I would not know him; he might go where hee list, and might do what hee pleased. I thought then hee had gone away; but now, two daies past, being in my coach at London, I saw him go by me; but what hee intendeth, or what hee hath done with the bookes which I gave him for the patriarche, I can yeeld no account *.

Lambeth, June 20, 1724.

Sir Thomas answers:

... I have acquainted the patriarch with your graces first and last letters concerning Metrophanes; who can heare nothing against him, that affection doth not enterprett to the better. Hee expects him daily, and your worthy present of bookes. I feare they will be pawned in the way. Of wandering Greeks there is SO GREAT STORE, that I am forced daily to deny my passports † ...

Constantinople, Dec. 9—19, 1624.

In a fourth letter, the archbishop gives this farther account of the good patriarch's "straye sheepe."

... I knowe not what to saye to the patriarke touching Metrophanes. His rogish countreymen did vndoe him: hee had bene fairely caried to Constantinople by sea, and I gave him viaticum to that purpose; but hee is gone with pretence to travaile throughe Germany by lande, in whiche course I cannot see how hee should carye the bookes alonge with him. I do muche feare, that hee hath

* Roe's Negot. let. 173. p. 253. † Ibid. let. 229. p. 320.

fared

Though its authenticity, I believe, has hitherto been unquestioned; nay, though it has been held in the highest estimation by men of distinguished learning, I flatter

fared so well in these parts, that hee will hardly reduce himselfe to the strict life of the Coloires in the Greek church* ....

Lambeth, Mar 30, 1625.

Sir Thomas, in his answer to the archbishop, says,

.... "Of his Metrophanes, hee [the patriarch] hath at last heard from Nurenburgh, who writes him a strange discourse, that Gondomar did seeke to debauch him, and send him to Rome; but failing, attempted his life, which made him forsake England; with many other friuolous aduentures. I wished the patriarch to beleeve little: but hee willingly heares nothing against him, vpon whom hee hath sett his affection. The truth is, they are futilissima natio. Long slavery hath made them, for the most part, lyars, base, and treacherous †."——

[No date.]

Metrophanes spent some time at Tubingen, Helmestadt, Altdorff, and other places in Germany. Upon his return home he obtained preferment in the Greek church at Constantinople, and afterwards became patriarch of Alexandria!

He wrote a confession of faith for the Greek church, entitled, Ὁμολογια της ανατολικης Εκκλησιας, which was republished, with a Latin version by Joannes Horneius, at Helmestadt, in 1661. The original, says Königius, is composed, "stilo puro et elegante." Königii Bibl. p. 537. Conringius, in a preface to the Ὁμολογια, speaks of his abilities in these terms: Potuit sanè, quod rogatus erat, optimè omnium præstare; quandoquidem valebat ingenio, judicio, et doctrinâ non proletariâ.

The design of this note is, not to charge Metrophanes with any forgery; but to shew, that there were men of learning among the Greeks, and unprincipled adventurers, who might be prompted to impose upon the world, by views of lucre, by vanity, or even by REVENGE. And this may serve as a caution to those, who may hereafter be induced to purchase antiquities in the East.

* Roe's Negot. let. 262. p. 372. † Ibid. let. 347. p. 488.

myſelf there can be no impropriety in this diſquiſition. On the moſt important ſubject, that can poſſibly engage the attention of the human mind, we are directed to avoid an implicit credulity, and "to prove all things" by an impartial examination.

If the objections, which I have here alleged againſt the authenticity of this celebrated Chronicle, ſhould be anſwered with liberality and candor, I ſhall readily join with the author in admitting its authority; for truth, and truth only, is the object of this enquiry *.

If, on the contrary, this eſſay ſhould be treated with aſperity; if I ſhould be accuſed of depreciating a venerable monument of ancient learning; if any dictatorial critic ſhould exclaim in the language of Horace,

> ———— fragili quærens illidere dentem,
> Offendet ſolido! Sat. l. ii. 1. 77.

or, in the plenitude of his benevolence, ſhould adviſe me to

> ——— remember Milo's end,
> Wedg'd in the timber, which he ſtrove to rend,

I ſhall comfort myſelf by reflecting, that ſarcaſms and contumely are no arguments; that the antiquities of Beroſus and Manetho, as they are exhibited by Annius of Viterbo, have been warmly defended; and that the moſt violent exclamations have been raiſed againſt thoſe, who have called in queſtion the moſt notorious forgeries, the letters of Abgarus †, Lentulus ‡, Pilate,

* Ego quid ſentiam ſimpliciter indicavi, libenter παλινῳδήσων, et in diverſam iturus ſententiam, ſi quis docuerit rectiora. Porrò, ſi quis, cum id non poſſit, tamen odioſius obſtrepit, ac ſtudio rapi, quàm judicio mavult, ne cum hoc quidem unquam tria verba commutaverim. Eraſmi præf. ad tom. iv. Hieron. p. 4.

† Fabric. Cod. Apoc. vol. i. p. 317.

‡ In ſome copies the epiſtle bears this title: Lentulus Hieroſolymitanorum

late *, Seneca to St. Paul †, and, above all, that collection of ancient rubbish, the Oracles of the Sibyls ‡.

lymitanorum præses, S. P. D. Romano S. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Apoc. vol. i. p. 302.

* Ibid. p. 298.

† Eight letters from Seneca to St. Paul, and six from the Apostle to Seneca. Ibid. vol. ii. p. 892. Sixt. Sinens. Bibl. l. ii.

‡ A collection of Sibylline Oracles, in eight books, was published by Xystus Betuleius, in 1545, 8vo. by Joh. Opsopœus, in 1589, 8vo. by Servatius Gallæus, in 1688, 4to.—The learned H. Dodwell calls this collection a counterfeit by some Christian author; and observes, that it was not reduced into the form, in which we now have it, before the end of the second century. Dodwell, Letter of Advice, &c. p. 114. Blondel on the Sibyls. Banier, Mythol. l. iv. ch. 2. Clerici Art. Crit. tom. ii. p. 345.

Supposing there were really such priestesses, as are usually called Sibyls, it is amazing, that men of sense and learning should contend for the divine inspiration of FANATICAL OLD WOMEN! Persius speaks like a more rational philosopher, when he says.

——VETERES AVIAS tibi de pulmone revello.

Sat. v. 92.

F I N I S.

INDEX.

A.

I N D E X.

INDEX.

B.

C.

Ceres

D.

Diotimus,

E.

F. FOR-

I N D E X.

F.

G.

 Gelo,

H.

I N D E X.

I.

Ionia,

K.

L.

Lycæa,

M.

INDEX.

N.

C.

I N D E X.

P.

INDEX.

Petavius

INDEX.

R.

S.

Seventy

T.

Thefeus

V.

W.

X.

Y.

ERRATA.

p. 4. l. 11. read, κ]α-
9. 7. — Τεω.
15. 16. — Hellefponto.
18. 5. — Μικων[ο]ς.
27. 18. — Phurnutus.
34. 20. — εδιδαξεν.
37. 34. — An feni.
84. 9. — confift.
85. 20. — πεντηκοντα.
100. 1. — his.
109. 15. — are.
127. 4. — Sextus Empiricus.
129. 34. — literariam.
156. 12. — Hellefponto.
163. 21. — πυλαιαν.
176. 14. — Peirefc.
195. 33. — prophecies.
211. 20. — the origin of Viterbo, &c. The Latin tranflation of this paffage, p. 210, is obfcure and equivocal. Notwithftanding the word *longè*, and the extravagance of the affertion, it is very probable, that Annius's rodomontade is to be underftood in this fenfe:

——"the origin of Viterbo, which was built by Ifis and Ofiris, two thoufand years before Rome was founded by Romulus."

I have not been able to meet with the original of the learned Spaniard, from which Schottus made his Latin tranflation.